TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
1	Mr. Morgan ... ... (Angora) **No. 437**	1931 Dec. 27	Heads of missions in Turkey ... ... Transmits report for 1931	1
2	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 445**	„ 30	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Reports arrangements for Minister for Foreign Affairs' journey to Tehran and conversation with Iraqi Prime Minister regarding Perso-Turkish relations	6
3	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 446**	„ 30	Turkish Cabinet ... ... Reports and comments on creation of Ministries of Agriculture and of Customs and Monopolies and gives records of the new Ministers	7
4	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 447**	„ 30	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Reports arrival of Iraqi Prime Minister and on progress of negotiations. Draws attention to attitude of Turkish Government towards the Assyrians	8
5	To Sir G. Clerk ... (Constantinople) **No. 11**	1932 Jan. 8	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Information given by Turkish Ambassador regarding forthcoming visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Tehran to negotiate a modification of the frontier, which would leave the whole of Mount Ararat in Turkey	8
6	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 1 Saving. Tel.**	„ 11	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Reports signature of Residence Convention and Treaties of Commerce and Extradition	9
7	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 8**	„ 6	Italo-Turkish relations ... ... Reports signature of agreement defining maritime frontier between Turkey and Italy and settling ownership of islands and islets off south-west coast of Turkey	9
8	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 9. Conf.**	„ 6	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding latter's visit to Tehran, objects of visit and motives of Turkey in desiring to secure a modification and settlement of the frontier	9
9	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 13**	„ 6	Syrian Throne ... ... Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs, who considers King Feisal's candidature to be dead. Turkey would prefer to see Syria a republic, but would have no objection to candidature of Abbas Hilmi Pasha and had so informed King Fuad	10
10	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 15**	„ 8	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 4. Reports further on negotiations and on matters discussed	11
11	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 17**	„ 8	Syria-Turkish relations ... ... Information from Nuri Pasha regarding Turkish interest in Syrian affairs. Turks still hope to secure cession of Alexandretta and dislike insistence of Lebanese State	11

No.	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
12	To Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 42**	1932 Jan. 28	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Turkish Ambassador's information that frontier treaty had been signed at Tehran on 23rd January. It provides for the inclusion of the whole of Mount Ararat in Turkey	12
13	To Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 21. Conf.**	„ 14	Turkish personalities ... ... Transmits complete revised report on	12
14	To Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 27. Conf.**	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 6. Transmits text of Iraqi-Turkish Commercial Treaty of the 10th January, 1932, and informs of substance of various letters exchanged	43
15	To Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 28. Conf.**	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 6. Transmits text of, and comments on, Extradition Treaty signed on the 9th January, 1932	45
16	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 29. Conf.**	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 6. Transmits text of, and comments on, Residence Convention signed on the 9th January, 1932	50
17	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 30. Conf.**	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 6. Information given by Nuri Pasha regarding situation reached in discussions on frontier brigandage, grazing, the Sheikh of Barzan, Assyrians and Turkish share of oil royalties	52
18	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 35**	„ 22	Smuggling on Turkish frontiers ... ... Refers to Part XXII, No. 53. Reports substance of three laws designed to deal with the contraband traffic. Creation of post of General Commandant for Customs Defence	52
19	Mr. Hoare ... ... (Tehran) **No. 46**	„ 27	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 8. Reports on successful visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Tehran and transmits communiqué summarising results of discussions	53
20	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 53**	Feb. 5	Koran in Turkish ... ... Reports on reading of Turkish Koran in various mosques. Press comment has been favourable. Discusses motives of Turkish Government in favouring the innovation	55
21	Department of Overseas Trade	„ 18	Turkish financial situation ... ... Transmits Angora despatch O.T. (A) 4 reporting failure of Turkish Government to meet its engagements with Messrs. Vickers and discussing possibility of Turkey negotiating a foreign loan	55
22	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 60**	„ 12	Religion in Turkey ... ... Refers to No. 20. Transmits memorandum by Mr. Brantwell on scene at St. Sophia during celebration of Night of Power. Irreverence and disorders suggest that official innovations are designed rather to break up old religious traditions than to inculcate piety	57
23	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 63**	„ 15	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 8. Persian Ambassador's statement that details of frontier rectification had been quickly settled. The Turks rejected a proposal to divert the Trebizond-Maku road to pass through Bezirgan	58

	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
24	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 85**	1932 Mar. 1	Travel to and in Turkey ... ... Refers to Part XXII, No. 39. Reports new regulations permitting greater freedom of travel for non-Moslems and fugitive Turks	58
25	Department of Overseas Trade	„ 11	Turkish financial situation ... ... Refers to No. 21. Transmits Angora despatch O.T. (A) 5 reporting Turkish proposal to foreign armament firms for postponement of payments. This action confirms Turkey's need for money	59
26	Colonial Office ...	„ 21	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Secret letter from Iraqi Council of Ministers to High Commissioner, Bagdad, enclosing copies of letters exchanged between Iraqi Prime Minister and Turkish Government at close of treaty negotiations	60
27	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 101**	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... ... Reports presentation of credentials by the Emir Zeid, the new Iraqi Minister. The new Minister's statement to the press regarding British mandate in Iraq and question of Syrian throne	64
28	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 102**	„ 17	Affairs of the Smyrna Quay Company ... ... Transmits and comments on Smyrna despatch reporting seizure of company by Turkish authorities on grounds of fraudulent and corrupt conduct of its affairs	65
29	Mr. Waterlow ... (Sofia) **No. 62**	„ 17	Bulgaro-Turkish relations ... ... Reports on two days' visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Sofia and substance of conversation with him. Tevfik Rustu Bey anxious to bring about a Bulgaro-Greek understanding. His dislike of French policy	67
30	Sir R. Maconachie ... (Kabul) **No. 39. Conf.**	„ 10	Anglo-Turkish relations... ... ... Reports Minister for Foreign Affairs' enquiry as to state of relations and his view that both Afghanistan and Turkey would do well to cultivate close relations with His Majesty's Government. His opinion that Turkey would welcome any encouragement from His Majesty's Government	70
31	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 117**	„ 31	Communism in Turkey ... ... Reports on arrests of Communists in Constantinople, Adrianople, Brusa and Samsun	71
32	Mr. Morgan ... ... **No. 124**	Apr. 1	Straits Commission ... ... Transmits commission's report for 1931	71
33	Sir R. Graham ... (Rome) **No. 274**	„ 8	Italo-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 7. Reports Minister for Foreign Affairs' speech at presentation to Fascist Grand Council of Italo-Turkish agreement defining status of Castelrosso islets and delimiting Italo-Turkish territorial waters	72
34	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 127**	„ 11	Turkish financial situation ... ... Discusses situation as a result of Turkey's postponement of payment on foreign contracts and prospects of Government weathering the economic crisis	73

	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
35	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 136**	1932 Apr. 13	Turkish financial situation ... ... Refers to Part XXII, No. 7. Reports anticipated budget deficit and steps taken to meet it, as well as proposals for balancing budget for 1932–33	75
36	Mr. Hoare ... ... **No. 165. Secret**	„ 5	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Transmits Tabriz despatch reporting arrangements for delimitation of frontier and dealing with frontier situation. Perso-Turkish agreements have passed first reading in Majlis	76
37	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 151**	„ 27	Turkish railways... ... ... Reports opening of Kutahya–Balikesir Railway and on progress of others under construction	77
38	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 152**	„ 24	Turkey and the League of Nations ... ... Reports conversations with Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, especially on Turkey's decision to join the League, although she would like to be invited to do so by the Great Powers	78
39	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 153**	„ 28	Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal ... ... Reports closure of tribunal and encloses report by British agent on work done since 1925. Doubts readiness of Turkish Government to execute judgments. Appreciation of president, M. Hammerich and of British agent and judge	79
40	Sir G. Clerk ... ... **No. 154**	„ 28	Russo-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 38. Reports departure of Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs on visit to Moscow. Emphasis laid by press on Russo-Turkish friendship	90
41	Mr. Strang ... ... (Moscow) **No. 69. Tel.**	May 8	Russo-Turkish relations... ... ... Reports official communiqué reviewing results of Ismet Pasha's visit. Agreement of principle reached on steps for more effective contact. Opening by Soviet Government in Turkey's favour of 8 million dollar credit	90
42	Mr. Strang ... ... **No. 231**	„ 3	Russo-Turkish relations... ... ... Reports details of visit to Moscow of Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs. Soviet Government spared no pains to honour their guests. Analyses reasons for this	91
43	Sir E. Ovey ... ... **No. 241**	„ 9	Russo-Turkish relations... ... ... Refers to No. 42. Transmits memorandum by Mr. Bullard reporting on Turkish Prime Minister's visit to Leningrad and discusses business agreement under which large credit has been opened in Turkey's favour	94
44	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 157**	„ 8	Turkish political situation ... ... Reports on disposal of members of dissolved Liberal party, most of whom have rejoined the Popular party. Fethi Bey remains in retirement, but still enjoys Gazi's favour	97
45	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 164**	„ 13	Russo-Turkish relations... ... ... Refers to No. 40. Reports Prime Minister's return from Moscow. Discusses grant of Soviet credit to Turkey. It will certainly ease the financial situation	98

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting Turkey.

PART XXIII.

[E 30/30/44] No. 1.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 4, 1932.)

(No. 437.)

Sir, *Angora, December* 27, 1931.

WITH reference to Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 26 of the 26th January, 1931, I have the honour to transmit herewith the annual report on the heads of missions in Turkey in 1931.

2 The passages enclosed in brackets have been taken from previous reports.

I have, &c.

JAMES MORGAN.

Enclosure in No. 1

Reports on Heads of Foreign Missions.

AMBASSADORS.

Russia.

(M. JACQUES SOURITZ, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 13th June, 1923. As soon as the reopening of diplomatic relations with His Majesty's Government was practically assured, M. Souritz made a point of showing his desire for renewing our personal relations, a desire to which I have willingly responded, for he is intelligent, his inner knowledge of the Turkish Government is probably better than that of any other diplomatist here, and it is always possible to discuss with him the questions dividing our two countries in an objective and reasonable manner.

As doyen of the Diplomatic Corps, M. Souritz is not altogether satisfactory, for his Government's desire to pose as Turkey's first and special friend precludes him from joining the other heads of missions in offering any unwelcome representations to the Turkish Government.

M. Souritz is married to a pleasant Russian *bourgeoise*, who has little or no bolshevism in her composition. 1929.)

Germany.

(Herr Rudolf Nadolny, fully accredited Ambassador, presented credentials on the 31st March, 1925. Herr Nadolny is little loved either by the Turks or his staff or his colleagues. His overbearing tactlessness estranges the Turks, his lack of consideration estranges his staff, while these qualities, added to a doubtful loyalty, naturally do not endear him to his colleagues. So far as Turkey is concerned, he will go down to history as one of the chief protagonists of new Angora, whither the German Embassy was officially transferred in December 1928. 1928.)

(Notwithstanding his vaunted enthusiasm for Angora, however, he seems to contrive to spend a very small proportion of the year there, and even then his entertaining is reduced to a minimum. On the other hand, the counsellor, Herr Aschmann, who will be remembered as German representative at Geneva before the entry of Germany into the League, and his wife are among the most hospitable folk in Angora, and are very widely and deservedly popular. 1930.)

United States of America.

(The Hon. Joseph Grew, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 12th October, 1927, after the signature of the agreement between the United States and Turkey, which made it possible for the former Government to replace its High Commissioner, Admiral Bristol, by an Ambassador. The change has been, from our point of view, all to the good. Mrs. Grew and the two daughters are, like the Ambassador, pleasant and good to look upon, and have made a welcome addition to Constantinople society. 1929.)

(Mr. Grew is a loyal colleague and a great gentleman, and is deservedly respected alike by the Turks and by the American and foreign communities. 1928.)

France.

(Count Charles de Chambrun, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 28th September, 1928. During the succeeding two years relations have, thanks in no small measure to the efforts of M. de Chambrun, entered a phase of normal harmony, which is only disturbed under the occasional influence of such thorny problems as the debt question. 1930.)

(It was understood, on M. de Chambrun's arrival in this country, that he would spend the major part of his time in Angora. Nevertheless, he has tended to drift back to Constantinople, except when serious negotiations with the Turkish Government make his presence in Angora indispensable. The French Government have not yet embarked upon the construction of a proper Embassy at Angora.

M. de Chambrun, who is unmarried, is a pleasant and cultivated colleague, who makes a point of doing service to the spirit of Anglo-French friendship. 1929.)

Italy.

(Baron Pompeo Aloisi, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 12th April, 1930, having been transferred to Angora, to his great delight, from Tokyo. So far, my experience of him does not incline me to repose in him any greater confidence than he inspired in Sir John Tilley. His wife is distinguished by a vivacity more appropriate to her fictive than to her real age. She is believed to hold the strings of a well-filled purse, and it is clear that the new Ambassador will achieve the feat of entertaining even less than the members of his staff. The Italian Government have taken, at an exorbitant rent, two villas for the accommodation of the Ambassador and for offices, and the Embassy is now definitely in Angora during the winter months. 1930.)

Japan.

Mr. Isaburo Yoshida, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 19th April, 1930. He called on me in Constantinople after this event, and then went on leave for a prolonged period. He is short, stout and jovial, and speaks English of a sort, but is little seen, least of all in Angora.

It was reported in the Turkish press at the end of the year that the Ambassador had been recalled to Tokyo, as he was to be appointed judicial adviser to the League of Nations Commission of Enquiry which is to proceed to Manchuria.

Poland.

(M. Casimir Olszowski, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 8th October, 1930. M. Olszowski had previously been Minister at Angora, but the Legation was raised to the status of an Embassy on the 1st June, 1930. The new Embassy house was opened early in the year, and is, like the German Embassy, a haven of substantiality in an ocean of jerry-building.

The large hospitality dispensed by the Ambassador and his lady have made it the principal social centre of Angora. At the end of the year it was rumoured that M. Olszowski was to be replaced by M. Wysocki from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Warsaw and transferred to Moscow. 1930.) He succeeded, however, in averting this calamity.

Afghanistan.

Sultan Ahmad Khan, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 28th March, 1931. He is short and somewhat ape-like in appearance, with a fixed grin revealing numerous gold teeth, speaks fair English, and shows himself very friendly to all and sundry. He seems to have a sneaking sympathy for Amanullah, with whom he claims relationship, and also for his own (pro-Amanullah) predecessor, Ghulam Nabi Khan, who, since he ceased to be Ambassador, has been living somewhat mysteriously at Constantinople.

Sultan Ahmad Khan is married, but his wife has not been known to appear in public, and is believed to possess no language but her own.

Persia.

Mirza Sadik Khan Sadiki, formerly known as Musteshar-ed-Dowleh, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 28th March, 1931. He is a retiring but pleasant colleague, speaks French and Turkish, and possesses a dignity of manner in inverse ratio to his minute proportions.

He lost no time in moving into the colossal new Embassy building, which still lacks the road of approach long since promised by the Turkish Government, and has the distinction of being the largest and ugliest diplomatic house in Angora.

Ministers.

Hungary.

(M. Tahy de Tahvar et Tarkeo, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 5th May, 1924.

M. de Tahy's impatience of the ways of the Turk does not diminish—1928), but Count Bethlen's visit to Angora in 1930 has smoothed off some of the sharper angles.

Austria.

(M. Auguste Kral, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 11th November, 1924. I have nothing to add to my predecessor's estimate of M. Kral, who, with his wife and grown-up daughter, are pleasant enough colleagues, though inclined to stop on at lunches and dinners long after the other guests, who are waiting for them to leave first, have ceased to enjoy themselves. 1927.) (But M. Kral contrives to convey an impression of insincerity, and I should not trust him farther than I could see him, if as far. 1930.)

He was run over by a horse and cart on the last day of 1930, and, after some months in the Angora hospital and a prolonged convalescence in his own country, returned to Angora in December 1931, much reduced in bulk, but otherwise unchanged.

Spain.

(Don Juan Servert y Vest, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 3rd August, 1925. I regret that I have had but little contact with the hermit of Buyuk-Déré, but at such times as I have seen him, M. Servert has appeared to be pleasant and jovial. 1927.)

His Royalist sympathies and fervent Catholicism have not as yet lost him his post, a fact which he explains by saying that the men of the new régime in Spain have not yet had time to "occupy themselves with his poor person."

Czechoslovakia.

(M. Milos Kobr, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 18th January, 1926. M. Kobr retains his love of a horse and of physical robustness, and Mme. Kobr still continues to cook the cakes for her fortnightly receptions during the Angora season. 1928.)

Bulgaria.

(M. Theodore Pavloff, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 5th May, 1927. M. Pavloff and his wife are favourable representatives of their country. He was, I understand, at one time a member of the Turkish Assembly, in the Committee of Union and Progress days, an experience that no doubt helps him in his task. 1927.)

Belgium.

(M. Louis Leclercq, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 11th June, 1928. M. Leclercq was formerly counsellor in Rome, where he acquired a devotion to all the amenities of town life, which—were it not for the distraction of bridge—would make his annual four months' solitude at Angora rather hard for him to bear. He is simple and very friendly, and is unmarried. 1928.)

Switzerland.

(M. Henri Martin has been raised to the rank of Minister, and presented his credentials on the 11th November, 1928.

While in Angora M. Martin is invaluable for obtaining information on points of detail, and prides himself on the number of despatches which he writes to Berne. At Constantinople he is driven to circularise his colleagues; while on leave he breeds dogs in England. M. Martin would like to be taken for an Englishman. 1928.)

Greece.

(M. Spyridon Polykhroniadis, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 30th November, 1929.

Speaks English and is distinctly Anglophil, but too prone to engage in lengthy political discussions and to imagine that His Majesty's Government are as engrossed in Balkan politics as he is himself. His ideas seem, however, fundamentally sensible, and the successful culmination of Græco-Turkish negotiations this year would suggest that he is distinctly *persona grata* here. His wife, a Serbian lady, considerably younger than himself, whom he married just before leaving Belgrade, is an agreeable woman, who likewise speaks some English. Both are characterised, on the tennis court and at the bridge table, by an ardour somewhat out of proportion to their skill. They entertain very pleasantly, notwithstanding the limitations of a Turkish house—which is soon to be replaced by a new Legation building. 1930.)

Roumania.

(M. P. Carp, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 29th May, 1930, and again on the 16th October, in consequence of the proclamation of Prince Carol as King of Roumania.

A friendly and insignificant-looking little man. His wife speaks fluent English, and is distinguished by a somewhat overwhelming affability and an inconvenient ardour for tennis. 1930.)

Egypt.

(Abdel Malek Hamza Bey, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 8th October, 1930. He was counsellor of the Egyptian Legation in London in 1929, and has been described by His Majesty's High Commissioner at Cairo as a leading lawyer and a clever and active young man, who, from extreme nationalism, has been converted to reasonable views, largely by contact with English people. He is extremely friendly, and speaks quite good English, but very little Turkish. Is apparently unmarried. 1930.)

Norway.

M. Sigurd Bentzon, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 8th October, 1930, the first Norwegian Minister to be accredited to Turkey. He is tall and distinguished-looking, speaks perfect English, and has a charming and vivacious English wife, who more than holds her own with the younger women of the Diplomatic Corps, both for looks and general attractiveness.

Yugoslavia.

(M. Ljuba Nesitch, fully accredied Minister, presented his credentials on the 16th October. As soon as he can complete the installation of a house he has taken in Angora he is likely to spend a considerable part of the winter there, a wise departure from the practice of his predecessors, on whom he is, indeed, a most welcome improvement. He has been given a credit for the construction of a new Legation at Angora, and hopes to get work started in 1931. I should not be surprised if he succeeds in effecting a very real improvement in Turco-Yugoslav relations. He is married. 1930.)

Denmark.

M. Peter Christian Schou, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 4th May, 1931.

Brazil.

M. D. de Pimentel Brandão, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 5th July, 1931, the first Brazilian representative to be accredited to Turkey. He speaks excellent French, having been *en poste* in Paris for years, and is pleasant company, though shy, as he himself confesses.

Finland.

M. Pontus Artti, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 12th November, 1931. He is the first Finnish representative to be accredited to Turkey.

Sweden.

M. Erik Boheman, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 30th November, 1931. He left Angora a few days afterwards for Geneva, where he is to represent his Government on the Disarmament Conference, and it seems probable that the extremely uncomfortable house leased, but never inhabited, by his predecessor in the former city will conduce to extensive periods of sojourn in the latter.

Though still in the thirties, M. Boheman has already had a brilliant career in the Swedish Foreign Office, where he became head of the Political Department in 1928.

Netherlands.

M. van Ketvich Verschuur, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 30th November, 1931.

Chargés d'Affaires.

Chile.

(M. Hector Briones Luco, the first Chilean diplomatic representative to be accredited to Turkey, arrived in this country in April to take up his duties as Chargé d'Affaires. 1929.) (Further than this nothing is known of him. 1930.)

Iraq.

Naci Shevket (Shaukat) Bey was recalled to Bagdad in October 1931 to become Minister of the Interior in Nuri Pasha's new Cabinet. He has not yet been replaced, and the Legation is meanwhile in charge of Ata Emin Bey, the first secretary, a rotund, good-natured young man, who speaks English fluently and is as frank and as Anglophil as could be desired, in marked contrast to his late chief.

Vatican.

(Mgr. Carlo Margotti, titular Archbishop of Mesembria, succeeded Mgr. Rotta as Apostolic Delegate to Turkey in April 1930. He had previously been a member both of the Roman Congregation for the Eastern Churches and of the Papal Commission for Russia.

Unlike his predecessor, Mgr. Margotti has never called upon me, but a member of my staff who has met him reports that he is affable, somewhat boyish in appearance, and creates a favourable general impression. While not officially recognised by the "lay" Turkish Government, he nevertheless enjoys *de facto* diplomatic immunity. 1930.)

Mgr. Margotti, in response to a hint conveyed by a leading Catholic member of the British colony, called on me during the past year, and enabled me personally to confirm the favourable impression referred to in last year's report.

[E 33/33/34] No. 2

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 4, 1932.)

(No. 445.)

Sir, *Angora, December* 30, 1931.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December regarding the visit of the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Tehran, I have the honour to report that Dr. Tevfik Rüstü Bey will leave Constantinople for Persia on the 4th January viâ the Black Sea and the Caucasus. On the conclusion of his visit he will return to Turkey viâ Bagdad.

2. Nuri Pasha, Prime Minister for Iraq, who is here at present negotiating agreements with Turkey, and who is on terms of old friendship with Tevfik Rüstü Bey, informed me that the principal object of the journey is to conclude the discussions between Turkey and Persia regarding their joint frontier. Nuri Pasha fears that the Persian Government will take advantage of the visit to enlist the co-operation of Turkey in pressing Iraq to agree that the whole Persian frontier line from Russia to the Persian Gulf should be the object of discussion, on the specious ground that the question of this frontier has been under negotiation since pre-war times; and that as the present negotiations are a continuation of pre-war negotiations it is only right that concessions made to Turkey in regard to what is now Iraq territory in the earlier period of frontier negotiations, should now be balanced by Turkish concessions in the north and Iraq concessions in the south. Nuri Pasha rightly qualifies this reasoning (if, indeed, the Persian Government has indulged in it) as ridiculous, but would not be surprised if one of the results of the Turco-Persian conversations were a Persian request, unofficially seconded by Turkey, for Iraq agreement to the thalweg of the Shatt-el-Arab being the frontier line between Persia and Iraq.

3. According to Nuri Pasha the present decision of the Persian Government to invite Tevfik Rüstü to Tehran is due to Russian prompting. He has noticed that whereas a year ago Turkey was sheering away from Russia towards the Western Powers, and was most strongly attracted by Italian influence, to which was due in great part the rapprochement with Greece, Italian influence has now waned, and Turkey has drifted back to her Russian comrade with whom she is more closely knit than before. Under Russian advice Tevfik Rüstü will look rather to the Shah for assistance in overcoming difficulties in connexion with the coming discussions than to Teymourtache, the former being alleged to be more frank, open to reason and tractable than the latter. If, as mentioned in my despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December, Tevfik Rüstü was sincere in assuring me that his visit to Tehran would be beneficial to His Majesty's Government, it may be that the Russian initiative, presumed by Nuri Pasha, was linked with a Russian suggestion that the susceptibilities of His Majesty's Government must be considered in the course of the discussions.

4. During a rambling, and not always lucid, talk with Nuri Pasha, Tevfik Rüstü suggested that an agreement should be made between Turkey, Persia and Iraq to collaborate if Kurdish troubles recurred on any of the frontiers of the three nations. Nuri Pasha expressed his willingness to watch the Turkish frontier if Turkey were having trouble with Kurds near the Iraq frontier, and also to watch the Persian frontier if Persia were having similar trouble near the Perso-Iraq frontier, but failed to understand how he could collaborate if trouble was confined to the Turco-Persian frontier. It is possible that Tevfik Rüstü expected that Iraq would in such a case make some public utterance, or engage in some activity of a nature to discourage Kurds within her own borders from associating themselves with rebels in Turkey or Persia, and to show these rebels

that they could not count on any support in Iraq, but definite details in this respect did not emerge from Tevfik Rüstü Bey's discursiveness.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad and His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 34/34/44] No. 3.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 4, 1932.)

(No. 446.)

Sir, *Angora, December* 30, 1931.

I HAVE the honour to report that, in consideration of the serious economic crisis through which this country is passing, it was recently decided to create two new Ministries with a view to relieving the congestion of work in the Ministries of Finance and National Economy and concentrating on the now supremely important domains of customs administration and agriculture. Government Bills were accordingly introduced in the Grand National Assembly on the 29th December, and duly approved by the Deputies, for the creation of a Ministry of Customs and Monopolies and another of Agriculture. This morning's semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" announces that Rana Bey, Deputy for Constantinople, and Muhlis Bey, Deputy for Kütahya, have been appointed Minister of Customs and Monopolies and Minister of Agriculture respectively.

2. The need for a separate Ministry of Customs and Monopolies is stated in the new law to be due to the special importance which customs operations and the working of the monopolies have recently acquired, as well as the urgency of preventing contraband; these considerations have necessitated the devising of stringent measures, the successful execution of which demands the withdrawal of such matters from the Ministry of Finance and the creation of a special Ministry to deal with them. Moreover, the unification of the hitherto separate administrations of customs and monopolies and their concentration in the capital will reduce the budgetary expenditure under these heads. Similarly, the institution of a Ministry of Agriculture is justified on the ground that the materials of economic operations (*i.e.*, agricultural produce) have acquired a world-wide importance, and that so much work of an economic and scientific nature is required to give agriculture its necessary development that the transference of these activities from the Ministry of National Economy and the creation of a separate Ministry of Agriculture is clearly desirable in the interests of the State. Nor is this decision likely to involve considerable additional expense, in view of the fact that the essential organisation of the two branches is already in existence.

3. The new Minister of Customs and Monopolies, (Ali) Rana Bey, who was then Deputy for Samsun, represented Turkey at the Universal Postal Congress held in London in 1929, and was formerly a post office official. He became Deputy for Constantinople in April 1931, and was soon afterwards elected vice-president of the Budget Commission of the Grand National Assembly. He speaks a little English, and is understood to harbour grateful memories of the numerous official attentions received during his visit to England.

4. Muhlis Bey, the new Minister of Agriculture, is a graduate of the Halkali Agricultural College, where he taught for a number of years, finally becoming its rector. He has also studied in Germany. He was Under-Secretary for Agriculture in 1926 and 1927, became Deputy for Brusa in the latter year, and in April 1931 exchanged his seat for Kütahya. He was soon afterwards elected secretary of the Assembly Budget Commission, of which his colleague (Rana Bey) was vice-president. Full biographies of the new Ministers will be transmitted in January with the list of Turkish personalities for 1931.

5. The creation of the new Ministries has resulted, according to the press, in the resignation of Behçet Bey, director-general of the Tobacco Monopoly, and the appointment of Ihsan Rifat Bey, Director-General of Customs, to the post of commissaire of the Constantinople Bourse.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 35/35/93] No. 4.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 4, 1932.)

(No. 447.)

Sir, *Angora, December* 30, 1931.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 430 of the 22nd December, regarding the visit to Turkey of Nuri Pasha, Prime Minister of Iraq, I have the honour to report that he arrived at Angora on the 28th instant, and was met at the station by Ismet Pasha. He has since been engaged in negotiations for the conclusion of commercial, residence and extradition treaties, and in discussion of problems relating to the Turco-Iraqi frontier.

2. He has informed me that the negotiations are proceeding smoothly. He had expected that Turkey would make difficulties about accepting his proposal that Iraqi shepherds should be allowed access with their flocks to Turkish pastures, even though he offered to pay rent for the privilege, and his expectations have proved correct. While not flatly rejecting his proposal, the Turkish negotiators do so in effect, by objecting to the shepherds being either Assyrians or tribesmen.

3. With regard to the security of the frontier, the Turks seem willing to delegate authority to a Turkish gendarmerie officer, to be stationed close to the frontier to act promptly in case of frontier raids in concert with a specially appointed Iraqi frontier officer. Nuri Pasha's suggestion that Turkish troops should be sent to the frontier to close it to followers of Sheikh Ahmad of Barzan, who has recently been disturbing the peace in Iraq, was met by the statement that it was impracticable, as no troop movements would be possible in the district concerned until June.

4. The Turkish attitude towards Assyrians is interesting. Although unwilling to allow Assyrian shepherds to enter Turkey, the Turkish Government some years ago raised no objection to the return of about 500 Assyrians from Iraq to their native mountains in Turkey, where they still are, and now urge Nuri Pasha to do what he can to prevent the Assyrians now settled in Iraq near the Turkish frontier from emigrating to Syria, firstly, because they can be used in Iraq to keep their Kurdish neighbours in check, and secondly, because Turkey does not wish that Assyrians should go to swell the non-Moslem minorities already established in Syria close to the Turkish frontier.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner in Bagdad.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 130/33/34] No. 5.

Sir John Simon to Sir G. Clerk (Constantinople).

(No. 11.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, January* 8, 1932.

THE Turkish Ambassador told me to-day that the Turkish Foreign Minister was on his way to Tehran in order to carry through a negotiation for a small modification of the line of the Turco-Persian frontier. He explained that at present the line runs through Mount Ararat, and that parties of brigands on the Turkish side, when pursued, escaped over the boundary, and *vice versâ*. Consequently, it is proposed that the whole of the mountain should be thrown within Turkish territory, and that Persia should receive by way of compensation a piece of territory further south which is now on the Turkish side of the line. The scheme for this exchange had already been under discussion, and the Foreign Minister's journey was for the purpose of carrying it through.

Ferit Bey added that on his return journey the Turkish Foreign Minister might arrange to pass through Bagdad, but, if he did so, the visit would be for the purpose of establishing personal contact with the Iraqi Government and had no special object.

I am, &c.
JOHN SIMON.

[E 260/35/93] No. 6.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 16.)

(No. 1. Saving.)

(Telegraphic.) *En clair.* *Angora, January* 11, 1932.

RESIDENCE Convention and Treaties of Commerce and Extradition between Turkey and Iraq were signed at Angora yesterday. Press states that first two agreements are based on most-favoured treatment, and that ratifications will be exchanged at Bagdad.

Texts will be forwarded as soon as possible.

(Repeated to Bagdad. No. 1, Saving.)

[C 411/411/22] No. 7.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 14.)

(No. 8.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January* 6, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that an agreement, defining the maritime frontier between Turkey and Italy, was signed on the 4th instant at Angora by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Italian Ambassador. The agreement is subject to ratification.

2. I am informed by the Italian Embassy that it had been intended to submit the matter to arbitration at The Hague, but that Turkey was ultimately persuaded by the Italian Government to agree to settle by direct understanding. As a result of the agreement Italy will cede to Turkey the small islet known as Kara Ada, formerly a dependency of the Island of Cos, and lying near the Turkish coast about 10 miles east of Budrum, and Turkey will recognise Italian ownership, and sovereignty over, the islets of Hypsili and St. George (Haghios Georhios or Ro) lying close to Castellorizo (Castel rosso) and of a few islets lying close to the north-east side of that island. The maritime frontier defined in the agreement follows a line beginning 3 miles south of Volos, running practically mid-way between Castellorizo and the mainland, and ending 3 miles south of Tuga Point (Tugh Burnu).

3. The official communiqué issued on the 5th instant, after referring briefly and without details to the conclusion of the agreement, states that it will reinforce the strong friendship, based on mutual confidence, existing between the two nations, and that there does not now exist any important question at issue between them.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

[E 223/33/34] No. 8.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 14.)

(No. 9. Confidential.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January* 6, 1932.

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December last, I have the honour to report that, when I called upon the Minister for Foreign Affairs this morning on my return from leave, his Excellency, who is here for two or three days waiting for the steamer that is to take him to Batum, began our conversation by telling me why he was going to Persia, and why he was going at this rather uncomfortable season of the year.

2. He was going now simply because, if he did not do so, he would, what with the Disarmament Conference and the visits he had to make to Moscow and Rome, be unable to go until late in the summer, whereas it was eminently desirable to settle up with the Persians as soon as possible.

3. As to why he was going at all, it was nominally, but also quite truthfully, in order to reach a definite settlement of the frontier question. He had told me in November, just before I went on leave, that he would go to Tehran if by so doing he could bring these protracted frontier negotiations to an end, and since then it had become quite clear to him that this was the only way to bring this about. The representatives of both countries, who had been conducting the actual negotiations, had reached agreement upon the really essential points, but they were haggling over other claims and counter-claims that did not really matter and were getting lost in the thicket of rather futile and unnecessary discussions which threatened, unless brought to an abrupt end, to envenom and upset the whole thing. Ismet Pasha had, therefore, entirely agreed with the Minister for Foreign Affairs that the only thing to do was for his Excellency to go to Tehran and settle the question on broad lines over the heads of the subordinate negotiators.

4. Obviously, it was not impossible to do this without undergoing the discomforts of a winter journey to Persia, though the fact that the Persians would be flattered by the visit would, no doubt, contribute to make the final negotiations easier, but Ismet Pasha and Dr. Tevfik Rüştü were taking advantage of this excellent pretext in order that the latter might gauge for himself the real feeling in Tehran towards Turkey. His Excellency said that for some time he had noticed a certain reserve, or rather nervousness, in the Persian attitude towards Turkey, a nervousness which could not be entirely attributed to the rather small difficulties of the frontier negotiations, and the Turkish Government wanted to get to the bottom of this feeling and either dissipate it or adjust their policy accordingly. If it was found that Persia's uneasiness simply arose from failure to grasp the sincerity of Turkish policy, the Turkish Government felt that the best way to set the Persian minds at ease was by personal contact between the Turkish Foreign Minister and His Majesty the Shah and his responsible advisers, including particularly Teymourtache. The Turkish Government wanted Persia to understand that Turkey's desire for friendship was loyal and sincere, but if Tevfik Rüştü Bey found that the Persians failed to respond to the spirit of his visit, then Turkey would draw the natural inference and take all necessary precautions against what the Minister for Foreign Affairs called "a Persian stab in the back."

5. His Excellency said that it was only to me that he had given these explanations, because he realised how closely interested we were in Persia, and he wished us to know exactly the motives for his visit.

6. I should add that Tevfik Rüştü Bey proposes to proceed from Tehran to Bagdad to visit King Feisal and, presumably, put the finishing touches to the discussions which Nuri Pasha has been having with his Excellency in Angora.

7. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister in Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 226/226/89] No. 9.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 14.)

(No. 13.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January* 6, 1932.

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 433 of the 23rd December last, I have the honour to report that I took the opportunity of my visit to the Minister for Foreign Affairs this morning to remind his Excellency of his fears that King Feisal was a candidate for the Throne of Syria, and to say that it looked at present as though the ex-Khedive, Abbas Hilmi Pasha, was now more prominent in that respect.

2. Tevfik Rüştü Bey replied that he agreed that King Feisal's candidature was dead, and said that, in principle, Turkey would prefer to see a republic in Syria; but if there was to be a King, the Turkish Government had no objections to Abbas Hilmi, whom they knew well and considered as a friend of Turkey. In fact, he had taken means to let King Fuad know this, thinking that His Majesty would like to see a member of the Khedivial house succeed to the throne, but it had been made clear to him that this was not at all King Fuad's view. The matter had consequently gone no further, though I have little doubt that Turkey's support of the candidature of Abbas Hilmi was a good deal warmer than the Minister for Foreign Affairs led me to suppose.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 227/35/93] No. 10.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 14.)

(No. 15.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January* 8, 1932.

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 447 of the 30th December, 1931, regarding the Turco-Iraq negotiations at Angora for the conclusion of commercial, residence and extradition treaties, I have the honour to report that Nuri Pasha hopes to reach agreement with the Turkish Government within a day or two.

2. According to Nuri Pasha the final form of the commercial and residence treaties will call for little comment. As for the Extradition Treaty, he has admitted that the murder of a Prime Minister of Turkey or Iraq shall not be considered a political offence, and has resisted Turkish pressure on him to agree that Iraq should deliver up non-Iraqis—other than Turks—accused or convicted of offences committed in Turkey. He went, however, as far as to promise that Iraq would be willing to deliver up to Turkey Persians or Syrians accused or convicted of offences committed in Turkey, but declined to give this promise in writing, either in the treaty or as an annex to the treaty. With regard to Europeans guilty of offences in Turkey, the Turkish negotiators grumbled at Nuri Pasha's refusal to agree that Iraq should deliver them up to Turkey, and their annoyance found vent in the remark that his refusal was, no doubt, forced on him by Europeans, who, they said, were still unwilling to trust Turkish justice. Coming to the question of expenses incurred in extraditing wanted persons, the two parties would agree that each would abstain from claiming a refund from the other.

3. Other matters treated during the negotiations were—

(*a*) Co-operation on the Turco-Iraq frontier, with regard to which it was agreed that special frontier officers should be appointed by both sides to keep in close touch in order to deal promptly with frontier incidents.

(*b*) Access of Iraq flocks to Turkish grazing grounds. This question was still unsettled.

(*c*) Entry of Iraq dates into Turkey. Turkey had agreed to allow dates to the value of £T. 100,000 to enter annually, with a 12 per cent. preferential reduction of customs duty.

(*d*) Turkish participation in Iraq oil royalties, with regard to which I am sending a separate despatch.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 229/229/89] No. 11.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 14.)

(No. 17.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January* 8, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that Nuri Pasha, Prime Minister of Iraq, who during his stay in Angora for his treaty negotiations has freely associated with the Gazi, the Turkish Ministers and other leading Turks, most of whom are old friends of his, has informed me that the Turkish Government are closely watching

events in Syria. They are hoping that the evolution of Syrian affairs may give them an opportunity of obtaining the cession to them of Alexandretta. It is their belief that France, which formerly abandoned to them Cilicia, may be induced to make this further concession. With regard to the internal constitution of Syria, Turkish statesmen dislike its division into numerous States, and especially the existence of the State of the Grand Lebanon. Although Nuri Pasha did not say so, I assume that the Turkish Government view with disfavour the existence of the Lebanese State because it destroys any hope of complete French withdrawal from Syria, a consummation which, as suggested *passim* in Mr. Morgan's despatches Nos. 432 and 433 of the 23rd December, Turkey devoutly desires.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 464/33/34] No. 12.

Sir John Simon to Sir G. Clerk (Angora).

(No. 42.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, January* 28, 1932.

IN the course of our conversation this afternoon, Ferit Bey referred to the readjustment of boundaries between Turkey and Persia, about which he spoke to me the other day. The treaty for the exchange of territory was signed at Tehran on the 23rd instant, and, as a result, when it was ratified, the whole of Mount Ararat would be within the boundaries of Turkey, while, by way of compensation, a corresponding area further south would be transferred to the Persian side of the line.

I am, &c.
JOHN SIMON.

[E 438/438/44] No. 13.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 29.)

(No. 21. Confidential.)
Sir, *Angora, January* 14, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 36, Confidential, of the 31st January, 1931, and to the Marquess of Reading's circular despatch of the 31st August last, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a complete series of notes on the leading Turkish personalities, revised up to date by Mr. Knight.

2. I have omitted from the present report the biographies of Dr. Adnan Bey, Ali Fuat Pasha, Bekir Sami Bey, Hüseyin Rauf Bey, Ihsan Bey, Nurettin Pasha and Rahmi Bey. Although they are by no means negligible and may possibly be heard of in the future, they have been little in the public eye for some years. I have added four new biographies, namely, those of Izzettin Pasha, Kemalettin Sami Pasha, Muhlis Bey and Rana Bey.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 13.

Notes on Leading Turkish Personalities.

Abdulhalik Bey, Mustafa.

BORN at Yanina about 1870. Belongs to a family of Albanian Tosks. Educated at Yanina and at Mülkiye College, Constantinople. In 1908 appointed member of the Council of State. Uncle by marriage of the late Talat Pasha. In 1910–11, Vali of Skoplje (Üsküp). 1914–15, Vali of Van. For a short period in 1915 was Under-Secretary for the Interior. 1915–16, Vali of Bitlis, and 1916–17 of Aleppo. Again became Under-Secretary for the Interior, holding

post until the armistice. Arrested in May 1920 and deported to Malta on charge of atrocities committed at Aleppo during the war. Learnt to play tennis and bridge there. In 1923 was Vali of Smyrna, when he got on well with Europeans. In July elected Deputy for Çankiri. In January 1924 succeeded Hasan Fehmi Bey as Minister of Finance, and held post till March 1925. Resigned on fall of Fethi Bey and became director-general of the Agricultural Bank and chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of Finance. In July 1926 became Minister of Finance. He soon showed himself aware of the weakness of Turkey's financial position abroad, and visited Europe in the summer of 1927, when he was identified with an arrangement for the settlement of the "coupons" question. In September he was re-elected Deputy for Çankiri, and in November, on the reconstruction of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet, became Minister of National Defence and Acting Minister of Marine. The latter post was subsequently merged in the former, which he retained in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet as reconstructed in September 1930. Succeeded Saracoğlu Şükrü Bey as Minister of Finance in December 1930, and retained his portfolio in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, May 1931.

Abdulhalik Bey knows Greek and speaks indifferent French. He owed his early advancement to his relationship with Talat Pasha, though he was never a prominent Unionist figure. Though not possessed of brilliance, he has considerable administrative capacity, and enjoys a reputation for scrupulous honesty —a virtue as acceptable at the Ministry of Finance as in that of Defence, where peculation in connexion with munitions contracts had previously been rampant. Is essentially a moderate, and the only member of the Cabinet to observe the Ramazan Fast. Is a keen gardener, a good bridge player and agreeable in conversation. Much liked by representatives of foreign business firms seeking contracts.

Ahmet Bey, Agaoglu.

Born about 1864 in Russian Azerbaijan. Son of an Islamised Caucasian Jew. Educated at Moscow, and started life as a journalist. Became an *agent provocateur* to the Russian Secret Service and organised Armenian massacres at Baku in 1904. In 1903–5 published two newspapers in Baku, but then fell into disgrace; went to Turkey and became a Turkish subject in 1908. Threw in his lot with the Committee of Union and Progress. Later, published a pro-Russian paper in Turkish, and became editor of the "Tercumani Hakikat." In 1916 became Minister of Education, and at this time was noted for his anti-British articles. Took a part in organising the Armenian massacres. In 1918 received £T. 100,000 from the Committee of Union and Progress funds. 1919–21, interned at Malta, where he learnt some English. In June 1921 he became director of the Press Bureau at Angora, and from then onwards was a close friend of Mustafa Kemal. Was in the past the chief worker for closer Russo-Turkish relations, often by means of editorial articles in the officially-inspired "Hakimiyeti Milliye," of which he was one of the editors.

In the 1923–27 Assembly he was a member of the Executive Bureau of the People's party and of the Foreign Affairs Commission, as well as reporter of the Constitutional Commission. Was re-elected Deputy for Kars in September 1927, and in November became a member of the party's Executive Bureau and of the Constitutional Commission. Resigned from the People's party in August 1930 to join the new Liberal Republican party founded by Fethi Bey. Was not re-elected at the General Election of April, 1931, and in October was appointed professor (history of law) in the University of Constantinople, whither he removed with his family from Angora.

Ahmet Bey is a short man with heavy eyebrows and dark glasses. He recalls the storied one-eyed mule of hideous aspect, but that aspect is benignant, and in his riper years tends to belie the lurid record of his youth. He was the "character" of the Grand National Assembly, and loves nothing so well as a joke, even at his own expense. He was seen occasionally in Angora society, accompanied by his blue-stocking, English-speaking daughters, who are no more attractive in appearance than their father. Speaks Russian, French, Persian and Turkish. Since the summer of 1926 his articles have become less hostile to Great Britain, and in conversation he delights to expatiate on the charm of English life, particularly as led at Oxford.

Ahmet Muhtar Bey.

Born at Constantinople in 1871. Studied at French school and military college in Constantinople. In 1891 received a post in the Consular Department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; in due course became its Sub-Director-General. In 1909 consul-general at Budapest. In 1912 Minister at Athens. Joined the Committee of Union and Progress, and in 1913 was for a short time Minister for Foreign Affairs. In 1917 Minister at Kiev. Returned to Turkey in March 1919. Became Deputy for Constantinople. Escaped to Anatolia in June 1920 and joined the Nationalist movement. In June 1923 elected Deputy for Constantinople, and in the same year appointed Ambassador at Moscow. In October 1924 he opted for his deputyship and returned to Turkey. From 1923 till 1927 was secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In June 1927 his appointment as Ambassador to Washington was announced, and in November he took up his duties.

Ahmet Muhtar Bey is a man of the world, and his long official career has given him at least all the outward characteristics of a diplomat. He strikes one, however, as being somewhat sinister, though he is very agreeable in conversation. Speaks French fluently. Is credited with strong Russian sympathies.

Ali Bey.

Born about 1875 at Afyon Karahisar. Educated at the Constantinople Military School. Commanded a battalion at Çatalca during the Balkan war, and served in the Great War as a colonel. Organised resistance to the Greeks at Ayvalik in 1919. Was elected a Deputy for Constantinople in December, and remained there to attend the debates till March 1920, when he was deported to Malta. Released a year later, he at once took his seat in the Angora Assembly. After his re-election in 1923 he became one of the chief organisers of the People's party, and in November 1924 was elected vice-president of the administrative council of the party, a position which he still fills. In March 1925 he was appointed president of the Angora Independence Tribunal; soon afterwards shot with impunity a fellow Deputy in the Chamber, and unconcernedly passed death sentences till the Independence Tribunals were abolished early in 1927. 1925–27 was president of the Defence Commission of the Assembly, and in November 1927, on his re-election as Deputy for Afyon Karahisar, became a member of the Budget Commission. Is President of the Grand National Assembly group of the People's party.

Ali Bey, known as the "bald-headed," is a curious phenomenon, for, in spite of his record, he is attractive. Until recently only spoke Turkish, but for the last two years has devoted an hour daily to the study of English, which he now speaks haltingly, but reads with a certain facility. He has an engaging smile, and was once very aptly described by a British visitor to Angora as resembling "a benevolent Scotch elder." During the summer of 1927 rumour was busy with his name as a possible successor to Ismet Pasha. It is doubtful if he could have filled the bill, though his surprising honesty could not have failed to be an asset. Previously much in evidence at the Angora Club, he now rarely puts in an appearance. He is not a conversationalist.

Ali Cenani Bey.

Born about 1880 at Ayintap, which he represented in the Constantinople Parliament, being for a time reporter for the budget. Was deported to Malta in 1919 on a charge of complicity in the massacres of Armenians at Ayintap. On being released he joined the Kemalist movement, and has been Deputy for Ayintap since 1921. In November 1924 became Minister of Commerce. In 1925 his commercial legislation showed that he was leading the ultra-Nationalist movement against Christian employees and foreign capital. In May 1926 he resigned, owing to reported differences with the Minister of Finance. He nevertheless continued to be influential, and for two years was the chief Turkish delegate for commercial negotiations with foreign countries, being responsible in particular for the Turco-Russian Commercial Treaty of March 1927. Became reporter of the Budget Commission in November 1927, but fell from grace early in 1928, when he was tried by the High Court for a misuse of public funds while Minister of Commerce. Was heavily fined, but his sentence of imprisonment

was commuted. After reappearing in influential circles, left Turkey for Damascus in mysterious circumstances in December 1929. Though reported to owe £T. 100,000 to the Turkish Government, he once more reappeared at Angora, where his past seemed in a fair way to being forgotten, but he was not re-elected at the general election of April 1931.

Ali Cenani Bey was for long the leading business man in the Ayintap area, and in business circles was considered honest and go-ahead. Much of his property is now in Syria, and he has frittered away most of his considerable wealth. He is a poor speaker, of jaundiced appearance, and has been described as active, resourceful and wily. He plays a vigorous, but not very good, game of bridge. His two daughters have received an American college education, but his wife is rarely seen. His son is at the English High School in Constantinople.

Ali Sait Pasha.

Born near Bandirma in 1874, of Circassian origin. Graduated from the Military College in 1898, and held several minor staff appointments till 1907, when, with the rank of major, he was sent to the Yemen. Returned to Constantinople in 1909, and in 1913, during the Balkan war, was in charge of the lines of communication. Was then for a time control officer on the Anatolian Railway until January 1914, when he was promoted colonel and posted to Sanaa, in the Yemen, where he remained until some time after the 1918 armistice, when he was finally induced to surrender to the British authorities at Aden, whom he had fought for four years, during most of which he was out of touch with his Government. Interned in Egypt for a short time, Ali Sait Pasha, who had now been promoted general, returned to Constantinople early in 1919 and was Military Governor of the capital till March 1920, when, on the occupation of the town, he was deported to Malta. Immediately after his release in October 1921 he joined Mustafa Kemal, and in the following year he succeeded Kâzim Karabekir Pasha as General Officer Commanding the Eastern Army. In October 1924 he was appointed Inspector-General of the First Army Area, and still holds this post. Was promoted to be a general of the first class in August 1927.

Ali Sait Pasha is pleasant, courteous and has a well-modulated voice. Was probably at one time decidedly pro-British, and still is, as he says, "in the interests of his country," but he chooses to forget rather than to forgive his treatment at British hands. Not a strong personality and takes no part in politics, but is interested in Iraq oil to such an extent that on an Angora ball-room floor he produced to a member of the Embassy a largish map, on which the position of his wells was clearly shown. Speaks a little English, a consequence of Malta, where he also learnt to play tennis. Both he and his massive wife used to be very popular in Angora society, but, when the attendance of military officers at social functions was vetoed in March 1928, they transferred their domicile to Constantinople, and their appearances in the capital are now all too infrequent.

Asim Pasha.

Born about 1882 in Constantinople. Passed out of Military College in 1902 with rank of staff captain, and was attached to the Imperial Guard. From 1907 to 1909 served on staff of Bitolj (Monastir) division. In 1909 appointed to General Staff. Pursued a course of military studies in Germany from 1912 till January 1915, when on his return he was attached to Turkish General Headquarters, remaining there till end of war. Again in Germany 1918–19. In November 1920 became chief of the Intelligence Section of the General Staff, but soon after threw in his lot with the Nationalists and became Chief of Staff to Fevzi Pasha. In November 1924 became General Officer Commanding the IXth Army Corps, in August 1926 was promoted Divisional General and later commanded the 5th Corps. In October 1928 was appointed sub-chief of the Turkish General Staff.

Asim Pasha is a tall, dark man of slight build and has a very pleasant manner. He has the reputation of being hard-working, strict, accurate and given to great financial economy. He got on well with his German superiors during the war, speaks German well, and knows some French.

Behiç Bey.

Born about 1880. An ex-colonel. In 1924 was chief administrator of the Anatolian Railway, a post in which he showed considerable ability and energy. In December 1925 became a Deputy for Constantinople and a month later Minister of Public Works. As a Minister he was a pronounced success, and showed great capacity in organising the existing railways and in dealing with the somewhat grandiose construction schemes of the Government. Resigned, October 1928, nominally on grounds of ill-health, and was immediately afterwards appointed Minister at Budapest.

Cafer Tayar Pasha.

Born in 1883 at Prishtina, of poor parents. Educated by the charity of an Albanian, who sent him to the military school. Saw service in Macedonia, and in 1907 became a member of the Committee of Union and Progress. Served at the Dardanelles, and in 1918 had command of the forces in Northern Caucasus. Early in the armistice he showed himself violently anti-British, and formed a military organisation at Adrianople, with which, in 1920, he threatened to resist the occupation of the town by the Greek army. From then onwards was known as the hero of Adrianople, for which, since 1920, he had been the senior Deputy. In 1924 he commanded the troops in the Eastern Vilayets, but his enthusiasm for Mustafa Kemal began to cool, and in October he resigned his military duties to take up those of a Deputy. In July 1926, along with Ali Fuat, Refet and Kâzim Karabekir Pashas, was arrested and tried at Smyrna for participation in the alleged plot against Mustafa Kemal, but was acquitted, largely, it is understood, owing to the fear of the authorities of his influence with the army. Ceased to be a Deputy in September 1927, and since then has been little heard of. Was sharply attacked in the Gazi's lengthy review of the revolution in 1927.

Cafer Tayar Pasha is a strong patriot, just and honest, and, as a result of his Adrianople experiences, is violently Græcophobe.

Celal Nuri Bey.

Born about 1880. A journalist; manager of a Young Turk newspaper in Constantinople in 1906. Expelled shortly after, and only returned after the Constitution, when he began to publish his paper "Ileri," which continued to appear till 1925. Was subventioned by the Germans during the war. In the early armistice ran his paper as a Kemalist organ until he was deported to Malta in March 1920. Shortly before, he had been elected Deputy for Gallipoli. Was released in March 1921 and at once took his seat in the Angora Assembly. Has since been a member of the Constitutional Commission of the Assembly, in 1922 being president, reporter in 1923 and secretary in 1930. During the constitutional crisis in March 1924 he was a warm supporter of the proposal to accord dissolution and veto powers to the President of the Republic, but the proposal was defeated. In September 1927 was elected Deputy for Tekirdağ (Rodosto) and in November, while still retaining membership of the Constitutional Commission, became reporter of the Drafts Commission of the Assembly. Re-elected Deputy for Tekirdağ in April 1931. Founded the "Yilmaz" newspaper, but disclaimed responsibility for it when it began attacking the Government in June 1931 and was subsequently closed down.

Celal Nuri Bey is something of an intellectual, clever and an intriguer. He is supposed to have Communist leanings, but was for some time chiefly active in an anti-Greek campaign nominally on behalf of Turkish non-exchangeables.

Cemal Hüsnü Bey.

Born about 1887. An ex-officer. Has been Deputy for Gümüşane 1925–30. 1927–28 was reporter of Assembly Commerce Commission, and is now a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission. In March 1928 became chief Turkish delegate for the exchange of populations, and in November of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. Appointed Minister of Education in April 1929, and Minister at Berne in September 1930, when he resigned his deputyship.

Cemal Hüsnü Bey is pleasant to talk to, speaks fair French and plays a fair game of bridge. He is, however, very impetuous, and on several occasions nearly torpedoed the Græco-Turkish negotiations.

Cemil Bey.

Born about 1885. Has followed a military career. About 1906 was commandant of the garrison at Salonica, and at that time saved Mustafa Kemal from arrest by Abdulhamit's secret police. During the armistice, when he held the rank of staff lieutenant-colonel, was in command of the defence forces against the Greeks at Catalca. In July 1923 elected Deputy for Tekirdağ (Rodosto). In May 1924 appointed general secretary of the People's party, and in January 1925 became Minister of the Interior. Though for a time he did well and exercised considerable influence, his position became weakened early in 1927 owing to alleged irregularities in connexion with Government contracts, and though re-elected Deputy in September, he ceased to hold ministerial rank on the reconstruction of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet in November 1927. In the same month he became a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission. Re-elected Deputy for Tekirdağ in April 1931. Is one of the two vice-presidents of the People's party and chairman of the Internal Affairs Commission.

Cemil Bey is reserved and intelligent, and speaks only a little French.

Cemil Bey, Professor.

Born about 1880. Has followed a legal career and specialises in international law, on which he is now the recognised Turkish authority. Was chief adviser to the Turkish delegation before The Hague Tribunal in 1927 in connexion with the "Lotus" incident, in which judgment was given in favour of Turkey. From 1922 to 1924 was one of the chief movers in a Turkish association for supporting the League of Nations, and in October 1924 attended the congress of League of Nations Societies in London. In 1931 was appointed member of the Permanent Conciliation Commission formed in accordance with the Arbitration Treaty with Germany of 1929. Was also appointed member of The Hague International Permanent Arbitration Court.

Cemil Bey is quiet, reserved and almost entirely absorbed in his studies. His family have received a European education. Is a keen gardener. Somewhat brusque of manner.

Cevat Pasha.

Born in Constantinople in 1873. Educated at the Galata Saray School and at the military school. In 1893 aide-de-camp to the Sultan. Later, sent to Germany to complete his military studies, and on his return secured rapid promotion owing to his father's influence at the palace. In 1913 appointed General Officer Commanding the Dardanelles Defences, and was in command of the Palestine army at the time of the Turkish collapse in 1918. In November 1918 became Chief of General Staff, and in December was Minister for War. Obstructed the Allies during the early armistice, and from the first was one of the strongest and cleverest of the Nationalist supporters in Constantinople. From October 1919 till January 1920 was again Chief of the General Staff. In March 1920 was arrested and deported to Malta. Released in October 1921, he at once proceeded to Angora, and in January 1922 was given the command of the Turkish troops near the Iraq frontier. Elected Deputy in July 1923, he took no part in the proceedings of the Assembly, having in the meantime been appointed military inspector-general in the eastern provinces. In October 1924 was in supreme command of the Turkish forces on the Iraq frontier when the *status quo* difficulty arose. Later in the month he resigned from his military duties, in order to take up his deputyship. Resigned from the latter two months later. In January 1925 was attached to the Iraq Frontier Commission in the capacity of assessor, and showed himself petulant and irascible. In September and December was attached to the Turkish Mosul delegation to Geneva. In April 1926 became a member of the Supreme Military Council, and in August was promoted to the rank of general of the first class. In November 1930 went to Geneva as military adviser on Turkish delegation to Preparatory Disarmament Conference.

Cevat Pasha knows French and German well. Is very Germanophil and something of an opportunist. Has good manners, is well educated and a capable administrator. He is old-fashioned, drinks little and says his prayers, but is stated to be jealous of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who served under him at the Dardanelles.

Cerat Abbas Bey.

Born about 1890. Early in 1919 became aide-de-camp to Mustafa Kemal, and at the same time was elected Deputy for Bolu. Had control over the activities of the Nationalist secret agents throughout 1920. In July 1921 went on a mission to Bulgaria with a view to organising trouble in Thrace, and in December became unofficial Kemalist representative at Sofia. He returned to Angora early in 1922, and in the autumn was one of the instigators of the Turkish insurrectionist movement in Western Thrace directed against Greek rule. In 1923 was re-elected Deputy for Bolu, and at the end of the year there was much talk and intrigue in regard to his proposed definite appointment as Turkish Minister at Sofia. In 1924 was president of the Turkish Aeroplane Association, in the interest of which he showed great activity. Was re-elected Deputy in September 1927 and April 1931, and since November 1927 has been a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In December 1931 became deputy chairman of board of directors of Turkish company exploiting notorious drug factory at Kuzguncuk on the Bosphorus. Maintains close contact with the President of the Republic.

Edip Servet Bey (Dağdevirenoğlu).

Born at Constantinople in 1879. Son of Servet Pasha. Left the Military College in 1898. Served with the Salonica army and in Thrace till he entered the Staff College in 1909. In 1911 was attached to the Yanina Regiment, and in 1913 promoted major. Held a staff appointment during the Balkan war, and was on the military staff of the Turkish delegation to the 1913 Peace Conference in London. Later in the year was for a few months chief A.D.C. to the Heir Apparent. Served during the Great War at the Dardanelles, in the Caucasus and in Palestine, and in 1917 was director of the Military Press Bureau. In March 1918 was a member of the Turkish mission sent to Roumania to conclude peace. During the armistice was a member of the Armistice Commission and director of Prisoners of War Section, and joined Mustafa Kemal in June 1920. Was afterwards chiefly engaged in arranging the supply of munitions, and in 1922 was for a time member of the Turco-Syrian Frontier Delimitation Commission. In November became Military Commandant of Constantinople and Acting Governor of Pera. In November 1925 became Deputy for Constantinople. In 1926 he represented Turkey at the Islamic Congress at Mecca, and made history by appearing in a bowler hat. In 1927 was a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission, and is now a member of that for Economic Affairs. Elected member for Gümüşane, May 1931. Is a leading member of the board of the Iş Bankasi and Balya Karaiydin Company, and is also Grand Master of the Angora Lodge of Freemasons.

Edip Bey is short, stout and jovial, with a face like the rising sun. On the rare occasions when, in the early hours, it has approached its zenith, he shows a taste for opera and old Turkish songs, and has a good voice. Though not involved so deeply in politics as are his companions, he is in great favour with the Gazi, and is influential, being an intimate friend of Saffet Bey. While not appearing bright, he is shrewd and sharp, and probably does more hard thinking than any of the coterie. Speaks French, Italian, Russian and German. Is hospitable, with a naïve courtliness of manner and a passion for doing things right and urging his friends to do likewise. Is perhaps the most popular Turk in Angora.

Enis Bey, Mehmet.

Born about 1887. From 1907 until the Great War was an official of the Ministry of Interior. Became vice-consul at Ancona during the war, and in 1925 was counsellor at Moscow. In 1926 became Director-General of Political Affairs at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, in October was given the rank of Minister, and in November 1927 became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Appointed Minister at Athens in 1929.

Enis Bey is pleasant and capable. In spite of indifferent health, he for some time carried the entire burden of the Foreign Ministry, and was universally liked by all who came in contact with him. Is straightforward and honest. The organisation of the Foreign Ministry out of complete chaos was due almost entirely to him, and his departure was generally regretted by the foreign diplomats at Angora. His wife is attractive.

Ercument Ekrem Bey.

Born about 1888, the son of Recai Ercument Bey, the Turkish poet. Appointed secretary at the Turkish Legation at Athens. Was recalled by Abdulhamit on suspicion of intriguing with disloyal elements. Later appointed to Bucharest. Was Mayor of Pera during the armistice. In 1923–24 was Director of Press in Angora. In March 1924 became private secretary to President of Republic, but fell foul of the President's wife, and in April became Assistant Prefect of Constantinople. Was dismissed in August, and remained unemployed till September 1927, when he again became Director of Press at Angora until the suppression of the post in June 1931. Appointed (July 1931) counsellor at Warsaw to act temporarily as Chargé d'Affaires.

Ercument Ekrem Bey is a short, stout man of a disagreeable type. He is certainly clever, but not at all to be trusted. Speaks fair English.

Esat Bey.

Born in Verria (Macedonia) in 1874. Educated in the Harbiye School and graduated in 1894. Gazetted to the Vth Army (Syria). In 1898 entered the Harbiye (Military) School, where he occupied different functions for twelve years. After the proclamation of the Constitution he proceeded to Germany in order to complete his studies. In the last phase of the Balkan War he was commander of the 93rd Regiment, and during the Great War commander of the 26th Division. He was pensioned at his own request when he was colonel and president of the military section (Harbiye Dairesi). Became afterwards president of the administrative council of a commercial venture, the Ordu Donanma Pazar (Army and Navy Stores), administrative counsellor of the telephone company, member of the Constantinople Municipal Assembly, and was elected Deputy for Brusa three years ago. He knows three foreign languages, and has occupied himself for many years with the study of pedagogy. Appointed Minister of Education in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet September 1930 and retained the post in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet May 1931.

Fahrettin Pasha.

Born at Constantinople in 1881. Educated at the Military School, where he was a class-mate of Enver Pasha. 1909, in command of troops against the Kurds, near Dersim. Later became an active Committee of Union and Progress adherent, and in 1910 chief aide-de-camp to the War Office. Held various staff appointments before becoming Under-Secretary for War in 1915. In 1916 commanded the Turkish division in Galicia, and in 1918 served on the Palestine front. In 1920 was a colonel in command of the Imperial troops at Konya. Joined the Nationalist cause in the summer of that year. Later in 1920 secured the command of the XIIth Army Corps, which he retained until the final success of the Turks over the Greeks. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Smyrna and became commander of the Vth Army Corps. In October 1924 resigned his deputyship on opting for military duties. In November 1924, on the resignation of Ali Fuat Pasha, became one of the three military inspectors-general, and in August 1926 was promoted divisional general of the first class, thus holding a higher rank than any of the Opposition Pashas. Was attached to the King of Afghanistan during the latter's visit to Angora in May 1928. On the 1st January, 1931, was appointed Military Commander of the district (Manisa and Balikesir), placed under martial law in consequence of the reactionary incident at Menemen.

Fahrettin Pasha is a tall, well-built man and a good type. He has been described as a rough diamond, but is honest, and, next to Fevzi Pasha, probably carries most weight in Turkish military circles.

Falih Rifki Bey.

Born in 1894 at Constantinople and educated at Galata Saray College, where he was later a teacher. Was secretary to Cemal Pasha in Syria during the war, after which he took up journalism and for a time wrote articles for the Ententist "Aksam." In 1920 joined Mustafa Kemal and wrote for the Nationalist press. Since 1923 has been Deputy for Bolu, and in the 1923–27 Assembly was secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission. In the summer of 1927 he went to Rio de Janeiro as chief Turkish delegate at

the International Parliamentary Congress, and returned deeply impressed by the advantages to be derived from an Anglo-Saxon, as opposed to a Latin, education. Throughout 1928 he continued to be in great favour, and in May was one of the Turkish delegates to the International Press Congress at Cologne. On his return he became president of the Commission for the Reform of the Turkish Alphabet, and, after the Gazi, has probably done more than anyone else to secure the general adoption of the new script. He owns the concession for the "Hakimiyeti-Milliye" and was a former director of the Anatolian agency. In September 1930 visited Moscow in the company of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and in April 1931 went to Albania on a mission connected with Balkan Union.

Falih Rifki Bey is at the same time the youngest and the wildest of the President's boon companions. He is frank, has a fair knowledge of French, and is an ardent Westerner. Has tremendous driving power but is a heavy drinker, and this and other excesses are, unfortunately, already beginning to tell their tale. An excellent bridge player. Wife, though not without intelligence, is undistinguished and lives mostly in Constantinople.

Ferit Bey, Ahmet.

Born at Brusa in 1875. Passed through Harbiye Military College in 1898 with rank of captain. Later went to Paris and studied at School of Political Science. Only returned to Turkey after 1908. Joined the Committee of Union and Progress and became Deputy for Kütahya. In 1910 joined the Entente libérale party and was exiled by the Committee of Union and Progress, in 1913, to Tripoli, where he met his future wife. He made his peace with Talat Pasha in 1915 and became consul-general at Kiev in November 1917. Recalled in December 1918, he resumed attacks on the Committee of Union and Progress. In 1919 was Minister of Public Works and of Finance under Damat Ferit Pasha. He resigned in July owing to his desire to reach an understanding with Mustafa Kemal. Joined the Nationalist cause in April 1920, was immediately elected a Deputy in the Angora Assembly, and soon afterwards became Minister of Finance. In September 1920 attended the Baku Congress and soon afterwards appeared rather pro-Bolshevik. In November 1921 was appointed representative of the Angora Government at Paris, which post he held till February 1923, when he was recalled because of certain offensive remarks made regarding the Allies. In spite of opposition in the Assembly, he became Minister of the Interior in October 1923. Was the subject of many attacks both in the Assembly and the press, but continued to hold the post till May 1924. Appointed Ambassador at London in June 1925. Was summoned to Angora in December 1930, with his colleagues at Paris and Berlin, to consult with the Government and the Gazi on the financial and general situation, when it was rumoured that he would be appointed Minister of Finance in place of Saracoğlu Şükrü Bey. This, however, did not materialise.

Ferit Bey speaks good French and Arabic. A thorough opportunist and rather unscrupulous. Wife is attractive and has helped him to make something of a success of the London Embassy.

Fethi Bey, Ali.

Born at Ohrid, Macedonia, in 1877. Graduated from military school in Constantinople in 1903 and saw service in Macedonia. Became an ardent Committee of Union and Progress adherent and took charge of Abdulhamit on the expulsion of the latter to Salonica. 1910–13, military attaché at Sofia, and 1913–17, Minister there. Was for a short time Minister of the Interior in autumn of 1918, and soon after was deported to Malta for political reasons. Released in April 1921, he proceeded at once to Anatolia and became Minister of the Interior. In July–August 1922 proceeded on a mission to Paris and London. In 1923 elected Deputy for Constantinople, and during two months was President of the Council of Ministers, which post he resigned on emergence of Republican issue. In November became first President of the Assembly. In March 1924 was regarded as being identified with the Opposition when the question of the President's powers was under consideration. In May chief Turkish delegate for Mosul discussions in Constantinople. Represented Turkey before the League of Nations in September, and later proceeded to Brussels again in connexion with

the Mosul question. Became President of the Council for the second time, and in November also held the portfolio of Defence. His period of office was marked by moderation, and he had the support of the Oppositionist Progressive party. In March 1925, on the outbreak of the Kurdish revolt, his Government fell because of his alleged lukewarmness in dealing with the rebels, and in the same month he was appointed Turkish Ambassador in Paris. Resigned his post in August 1930, when he reappeared in Turkey as the founder of a new political party—the Liberal Republican—with the full approval of the Gazi, probably even by his order. To facilitate his entry into the Assembly, was returned unopposed as Deputy for Gümüşane. Was obliged, by failure of presidential support, to dissolve his party in November, but retained the Gazi's friendship, and they were much together during the annual festivities at Angora, October–November 1931.

Fethi Bey has Mongol features. He is pleasant to talk to, speaks good French, and is essentially a moderate. He has an attractive English-speaking wife, and his daughter is being educated at the English High School for Girls, Constantinople. There is evidence that even from Paris he exercised no little influence at Angora, and a visit which he paid to the capital in 1928 had much to do with the Turkish acceptance of the Ottoman debt settlement.

Fevzi Pasha, Mustafa, Field-Marshal.

Born in Constantinople in 1874. Graduated from the military college in 1898. Saw service in Macedonia. From then until 1913 held numerous staff appointments. During the war fought at Gallipoli, in the Caucasus and in Palestine, and was Chief of the General Staff, 1918–19. In November 1919 was sent on a mission to Anatolia by the Constantinople Government and established relations with Mustafa Kemal. Held the portfolio of War in Constantinople Government during February and March 1920. He was throughout in close touch with Mustafa Kemal, and on his resignation he went to Anatolia and was at once appointed Minister for National Defence. Played a large part in building up the Kemalist army and in organising transport and the production of ammunition. In 1921 he became for a time rather a back number, but later re-established his position and became Chief of Staff. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Constantinople, and since then has been annually reappointed Chief of Staff. Resigned his Deputyship in October 1924 on opting for military duties. In the autumn of 1927 was suffering from diabetes and went to Europe for a cure. Since then his health has much improved.

Fevzi Pasha had the confidence of Enver Pasha during the Great War, and is now understood to have that of Mustafa Kemal. Reputed to be a capable officer, especially in matters relating to administration. Regarded by Halide Hanim as a good soldier, but nothing more. Has considerable influence with the army. Was in his time a pan-Turanian as well as a pan-Islamist, and on the abolition of the Caliphate was regarded as the only rival of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, of whose manner of life he was understood strongly to disapprove. Was regarded as the leader of the war party at Angora during the Mosul crisis. Used to be regarded as old-fashioned and kept his womenfolk secluded, but he is now seen more in public. Speaks a little French and is pleasant to talk to.

Hakki Şinasi Pasha.

Born at Constantinople in 1868, the son of a Foreign Ministry official. Studied first at the naval, and afterwards at the medical, school. Followed medical courses at Berlin, Heidelberg and Munich. While a doctor at the Hamidiye Hospital in 1904 was expelled to Anatolia. On his return in 1906 was reinstated with rank of colonel, and later promoted general. Retired in 1918, and from then till 1924 occupied himself with municipal affairs. In November 1924 became a Deputy for Constantinople, and was in 1927–28 chairman of the Public Health Commission of the Assembly. In September 1925 was Turkish Red Crescent delegate at the International Red Cross Conference at Geneva. In March 1928 became chief inspector of the People's party for Constantinople, and in the late summer mediated successfully in a Constantinople tramway strike. Elected a Deputy for Erzerum in April 1931.

Hamdi Bey, Mehmet.

Born about 1880. During the armistice was head of the Refugee Section of the Ministry of Interior in Constantinople. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Erzincan. In 1924 was assistant Turkish delegate for the exchange of Turco-Greek populations, and in 1923 became chief delegate on the appointment of Tevfik Rüştü Bey as Minister for Foreign Affairs. Negotiated the Turco-Greek Agreement of 1925, and in June was appointed Minister at Vienna. Short and stoutish, Hamdi Bey speaks French fairly well and is intelligent and moderate.

Hamdullah Suphi Bey.

Born at Constantinople in 1881. Educated at Galata Saray College. In 1901 entered Ministry for Foreign Affairs as a clerk. Remained there till 1908, occupying himself in writing poetry. After the Constitution continued his literary efforts, and was the founder of a society of young poets which developed into the Turkish Ojaks. In 1910 appointed Professor of Turkish literature at the Constantinople University. Was for a time in opposition to the Committee of Union and Progress, but after the Balkan war was on good terms with the Unionists. Later became the leading propagandist of pan-Turanianism. Travelled in Germany during the war. In the early armistice was anti-British and pro-Italian. In April 1920 joined Mustafa Kemal at Angora. Later in the year was for a time head of the Kemalist Intelligence Service. January–April 1921, Minister of Public Instruction. In April became Vice-President of the Assembly, and occupied himself chiefly with the pan-Islamic Congress, then held in Angora. Was again Minister of Public Instruction during the latter half of 1921, and was one of the first of the Angora leaders to make a speech against the Sultan. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Constantinople and later president of the Turkish Ojaks, to which he devoted most of his time and energy. During 1923 was president of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, and from March till December 1925 was again Minister of Public Instruction, resigning finally on grounds of ill-health. September 1927 re-elected for Constantinople, and is a member of the Constitutional Commission of the Assembly. In October 1930 went to Athens as a member of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan Congress. Early in 1931 the Turkish Ojak organisation was merged in that of the Popular party, to his great grief, and in April, not having been re-elected Deputy, he was appointed Minister at Bucharest.

Hamdullah Suphi Bey is an idealist of the pan-Turanian school, and was the moving spirit of the Turkish Ojaks until their suppression. He is a keen moderniser. Is not possessed of means, and his honesty is above reproach. Is violently anti-Russian; one of his sons is at the English High School for Boys at Constantinople.

Hasan Bey.

Born in Trebizond in 1884. Said to be of Laz origin. Educated at Constantinople and in Paris, where, from 1909–14, he studied at the School of Political Science. During the war was head of the Economic Section of the Food Supplies Directorate, and in December 1919 became Deputy for Trebizond. Joined the Kemalist movement in March 1920, and in May 1921 became Minister of Finance, holding the post until April 1922. By this time he was apparently very pro-Bolshevik in sympathy. From May till July 1922, Minister of Economics and Public Works. In November was appointed member of the Turkish delegation to the Lausanne Conference, when he acted as financial expert. September 1923, was again Minister of Economics. In March 1924, Minister of Commerce, and in March 1925 again Minister of Finance, resigning in July 1926, ostensibly on grounds of ill-health. Continued, however, to play an important part in Turkish financial matters. Was re-elected Deputy in September 1927, and in November, when it was rumoured that he would re-enter the Ministry, he became first Vice-President of the Assembly. Was President of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan Congress at Athens, October 1930. In May 1931 went with the Minister for Foreign Affairs to Geneva to attend the European Union Conference, and while there attended also the International Conference for the Limitation of Dangerous Drugs. In October was president of the Second Balkan Conference, held at Constantinople.

Hasan Bey fancies himself as an expert in matters pertaining to finance. Knows French fairly well; is a man of private means, wily, and has a sense of humour. Not attractive personality. Probably a bully, has been described as something of an "apache," and most nearly answers the description when playing bridge, which he does very well. Has a young and attractive little wife.

Hasan Fehmi Bey.

Born at Gümüşane in 1877. Educated at Constantinople, and from 1902 to 1910 held various posts in the Turkish Civil Service. In 1910, Governor of Gireson (Kerasund), and in 1912 of Komotini (Gümülcina), 1913–18, Deputy for Gümüşane. Joined Mustafa Kemal in April 1919. In 1920 Vice-President of the Assembly. In April 1922 was Minister of Finance. In 1923 elected Deputy for Gümüşane. August 1923 till January 1924 again Minister of Finance, resigning because of a dispute over the Anatolian Railway question. November 1924 till March 1925, Minister of Agriculture. December 1925, became one of the Government delegates on the board of the Ottoman Bank. Was re-elected Deputy in September 1927. In November of that year became chairman of the Finance Commission, and in November 1928 a member of the Constitutional Commission. Re-elected Deputy for Gümüşane in April 1931, and elected chairman of the Budget Commission in May.

Hasan Fehmi Bey is not regarded as a strong man, and during his occupation of ministerial posts was little more than a nominee of Mustafa Kemal.

Haydar Bey.

Born at Philippopolis about 1885. Having completed his studies at Galata Saray College, he entered the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and remained there till 1911, when he became second secretary at Sofia. Attended the London Peace Conference in 1913 and then remained at Sofia until February 1919, when he returned to the Ministry. June–December 1919 was Director of Press, and in May 1920 became private secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, retaining the post till the fall of the Constantinople Government in November 1922. Was a member of Turkish peace delegations to London in February 1921 and March 1922. Early in 1924 was a Turkish delegate for exchange of populations, and in August became first secretary in Berlin. In August 1925 was appointed Chargé d'Affaires at Stockholm, Oslo and Copenhagen. In November 1928 was appointed Minister at Belgrade, and in the autumn of 1931 acted as Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the place of Numan Bey.

Haydar Bey is something of an intriguer and rather an opportunist, having tacked fairly successfully to the varying winds which have blown in Turkey during the last generation. He is, however, aimable and good-mannered, as well as able and intelligent. Strongly favours a close Bulgaro-Turkish friendship.

Hikmet Bey, Yusuf.

Born in Constantinople about 1882. Educated at the Galata Saray College. Entered the Turkish Diplomatic Service and served as a secretary at Paris and Berlin. Returned to the Sublime Porte early in the armistice, but in 1920 went to Angora, where he at once became Political Director at the Foreign Ministry, and accompanied the Nationalist mission to Europe in 1922. In 1924 was counsellor in London, and in January 1925 again became head of the Political Section of the Foreign Ministry. In the summer of 1925 he became Minister at Belgrade, holding the post till November 1927, when he became private secretary to the President of the Republic. In July 1928 was appointed Ambassador at Kabul where he has not been a success, but his position was made very difficult by the collapse of Amanullah and the consequent eclipse of Turkish influence. In 1930–31 went on tour in India, and on his return treated His Majesty's Minister at Kabul to animadversions on the laxity of British rule in that country.

Yusuf Hikmet Bey is short, dark, and somewhat insignificant in appearance. He is, however, intelligent. He has agreeable manners, and, in spite of slight deafness, was generally popular in Belgrade, where His Majesty's Minister found him pleasant to deal with. He might, nevertheless, turn out to be something of a mischiefmaker. Is said to be a voracious reader and collector of news, without, however, the capacity of digesting or even appraising his material.

Hilmi Bey.

Early history unknown. Appointed Vali of Adana in 1925, and was soon afterwards fined by the Angora Independence Tribunal for failure to send certain witnesses from Adana to the capital. Later became local Popular Party Inspector. In September 1927 was elected Deputy for Adana, in October became a member of the executive bureau of the Popular party, and in November a member of the Internal Affairs Commission of the Assembly. Elected Vice-President of this Commission in 1928, reporter in 1929, and again Vice-President in November 1930. In December 1930 succeeded Zekâi Bey as Minister of Public Works, and retained his portfolio in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, May 1931.

Hulusi Fuat Bey.

Born in 1885 at Constantinople. Member of the Turkish Diplomatic Service. Was employed at Berlin and Vienna during the war, and at Christiania in 1923, when he received an appointment in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Angora. May 1924 became "chef du cabinet" of Adnan Bey, delegate at Constantinople of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. In October went to London as a member of the Turkish delegation in the Congress of the League of Nations Societies. Resigned in March 1925 for reasons unknown, though it was suggested that (1) he had outshone Nusret Bey, (2) he was not fully sympathetic with Angora. In May appointed Chargé d'Affaires at Tokyo. In September 1928 was transferred in the same capacity to Nanking, whence he was recalled to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in August 1931, to become Director-General of the VIth Department.

Hulusi Fuat Bey is a son of "Deli" Fuat Pasha, and his wife, who is a pleasant woman, is an excellent linguist, and is a daughter of Mahmut Muhtar Pasha. He is pleasant to deal with, accustomed to European ways, enjoys a good cigar, not very clever, and believed to be fairly straight. Knows English and speaks excellent French.

Hüseyin Cahit Bey.

Born at Constantinople in 1876. Took up the teaching profession, but in 1908 went over to journalism and became, till 1912, editor and part proprietor of the "Tanin," the official organ of the Committee of Union and Progress. From 1908 was one of the Constantinople Deputies in the Chamber, of which he became one of the vice-presidents during the war. Before the war was representative of the Turkish bondholders on the Public Debt. Played no great political part during the war, but at the armistice was arrested and deported to Malta. Released in April 1921, he spent the following year in Europe. On his return to Constantinople, he recommenced publication of the "Tanin," and, for a time, supported the Kemalist régime. Nevertheless, he kept in close touch with the surviving Committee of Union and Progress leaders, and gradually began to take a more independent line in his writings. By 1923 the "Tanin" had become the chief organ of the Opposition, and in December Cahit Bey was tried and acquitted for the publication of the Aga Khan letter. In April 1925 he was again arrested for his publications, the "Tanin" was suppressed and Cahit Bey was sentenced by the Independence Tribunal to a life-time confinement in a fortress (Çorum). He was again brought before the tribunal in August 1926 for alleged participation in the Smyrna plot, but was acquitted and soon afterwards released. In 1930 became chairman of the Board of Directors of the Bank of Industries and Mines.

Tall and slight, Cahit Bey was remarkable for his biting satire, and was feared by his enemies. Has written several poems and produced a number of scholastic books. His former power was doubtless derived partly from his association with Cavit Bey and the Government seem to have brought him to terms.

Hüseyin Cevat Bey.

Born at Constantinople in 1886. Educated at Galata Saray College, and entered the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 1898. Appointed to Vienna (1899), Athens (1901), Cetinje (1905), Petersburg (1907), London (1909), Minister at Cetinje (1911), and at Belgrade (1913). 1917–19 was Minister at Stockholm,

1920–22 at Berne. In 1923 was appointed by Angora to Bucharest. Transferred to Paris in November 1924, his speech on presenting his credentials in February 1925 was much criticised in the Assembly, and he was recalled. In April was appointed Minister at Athens. In December 1928 was appointed Ambassador at Tokyo, and in the autumn of 1931 Ambassador at Warsaw.

Hüseyin Cevat Bey is fat, affable, and very popular. Believed to be honest and well-intentioned. Is rich, and married to a young wife. Believed to be Anglophil in sympathy, he knows French and German well, speaks English, plays golf and was responsible for its introduction into Montenegro.

Hüseyin Ragip Bey.

Born about 1885 in Rhodes. A brother of Reşit Galip Bey. In 1923 was appointed Turkish representative in Paris. Transferred to Bucharest in April 1925. Appointed Ambassador at Moscow in January 1929. Is of pleasant address, unmarried, speaks good French, and is well looked upon in the highest Angora circles.

Hüsrev Bey, Ridvanbeyoğlu.

Born in 1884. A soldier *de carrière;* was military attaché at Athens at the outbreak of the Great War, and later served on the staff of the Caucasus army as an intelligence officer. During the early part of the Nationalist struggle was private secretary to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In February 1921 was a member of Bekir Sami Bey's Mission to Paris, London and Rome. In July 1923 was elected Deputy for Urfa. In May 1924 became Minister at Budapest. Later resigned his deputyship on opting for his Legation. In August 1926 was appointed Minister at Sofia. In July 1930 was appointed Ambassador at Warsaw, but did not proceed, and the following month was appointed Ambassador at Tehran, where he became increasingly unpopular, making no secret of his disgust for all things Persian. In 1931 the Persian New Year arrangements were altered to prevent his making a speech as doyen of the Diplomatic Corps.

Hüsrev Bey is tall and good-looking, and is a friend of the Gazi.

Ibrahim Tali Bey.

Born about 1885. An ex-army doctor by profession, and served in that capacity during the Great War. Came under the Gazi's notice at Diyarbekir in 1916 or 1917. Later became Turkish consul at Batum. In February 1924 it was rumoured that he would succeed Adnan Bey as representative of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Constantinople, but, instead, he went to Salonica to investigate alleged abuses on the part of the Turkish consul there. In April was appointed Minister at Warsaw. January 1926 elected Deputy for Diyarbekir, and returned to Angora in the following month. In May became inspector-general of the People's party in Constantinople, and, as such, had very extensive powers. Took a prominent part in the 1927 elections and was himself again returned for Diyarbekir. In October became vice-president of the Executive Council of the People's party, and in November a member of the Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission. In December resigned his deputyship on being appointed inspector-general of the Eastern Provinces, with extensive powers. Has had considerable success in modernising the backward districts under his jurisdiction.

Ibrahim Tali Bey is a short, bullet-headed man and wears heavy glasses. He speaks French and a little English, and is cultured. Is pleasant in conversation, genial, tactful and broad-minded. Has been to Bombay, studies Anglo-Indian administration and makes his officials start work at 7·30 and stop at 1.

Ihsan (Latif) Pasha.

Born about 1875 at Constantinople. Left military college as a staff captain in 1896. 1900–06 military attaché at Athens. Joined the General Staff as lieutenant-colonel in 1906. From 1908 till 1911 he served on the staff of the VIIth Army, being then appointed its chief. Later, recalled to the Imperial General Staff, was placed in command of Edremit Division in 1912, and in 1914 was transferred with rank of brigadier-general to the 34th Division at Erzerum. Was captured after the battle of Sarikamiş in January 1915 and sent as a prisoner to Siberia, whence he escaped in December, making his way on foot to China and from there returning by way of America to Constantinople. On his return he was placed on the retired list by Enver and took up the post of

mayor at Yeniköy, on the Bosphorus. Brought back after the armistice, he became in 1919 a member of the Military Court of Constantinople, in 1920 Inspector of Prisoners of War, and in 1921 Director of the War Department. This brought him in close touch with the Angora Government, and in December he became superintendent of their organisations in Constantinople. Though officially unemployed from November 1922, he was charged with the defence of Constantinople in the event of war between Turkey and the Allies. In July 1924 became Vali of Smyrna, in 1926 Deputy for Constantinople, and since 1927 has been a member of the National Defence Commission of the Assembly. Elected Deputy for Giresun (Kerasund) in April 1931.

Ihsan Latif Pasha is a thin, short man with ape-like features. He is something of an opportunist. He is married and has an American-educated, English-speaking daughter, who is married to Emin Ali Bey, one of the legal advisers of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. He has published an account of his escape from Siberia.

Ismet Pasha.

Born in 1880 at Smyrna, where his father was a small landed proprietor. Educated at the military college, and from 1906–12 saw service in Thrace and the Yemen. Joined the General Staff in 1914. 1915–16 Chief of Staff of the Caucasus army. 1917–18 in Palestine, and became Under-Secretary for War in the autumn of 1918. Early showed Nationalist sympathies and joined Mustafa Kemal in March 1920, at once becoming Chief of Staff of the Nationalist forces. Assumed command of the western army in December 1920 and was chief Turkish delegate at the Mudanya Conference in October 1922. In the same month was appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs, and in November went to Lausanne as chief Turkish delegate. Signed the Treaty of Lausanne on behalf of Turkey in July 1923, and in October became Prime Minister, retaining the portfolio of Foreign Affairs. At the same time, Mustafa Kemal delegated to him the functions of president of the People's party. During 1924, owing to his ill-health, his Administration became more and more unpopular, and he resigned in November. On the outbreak of the Kurdish revolt in March 1925 he was again summoned to power by Mustafa Kemal, and has since been Prime Minister, though, in August 1925, it was rumoured that his relations with the Gazi had become strained owing to his opposition to the divorce of Latife Hanim. This rumour proved unfounded, and his position remained as strong as ever. In August 1926 he was promoted general of the first class, and in November 1927, after the general election, at which he was re-elected for Malatya, he reconstructed his Cabinet on more moderate lines. In 1930 his health was not good, and he was subjected to much criticism, but defended himself strongly on formation of Liberal party in August. His triumph was again complete when Fethi Bey was forced to dissolve that party in November. Re-elected for Malatya in April 1931, and soon after again became Prime Minister with the same colleagues as before.

Ismet Pasha, in his army days, was regarded as an exceptionally capable staff officer, an indefatigable worker and was, to a large extent, responsible for the final Nationalist success against the Greeks in 1922. At Lausanne he showed himself a stubborn but able negotiator. Is courteous and never shows signs of being ruffled, but suffers from deafness, which, however, he probably finds convenient at times. Is the only one of the prominent early Nationalist leaders who has retained the confidence of Mustafa Kemal and remains, as he has been for the last six years, the President's right-hand man. According to Halide Hanim (July 1926): "He subordinates himself entirely to the Gazi and only wants to hang everybody." Though this estimate is undoubtedly overcoloured, there is certainly a hard strain in Ismet Pasha's character, while, as regards the Gazi, it is probably truer to say that they make an admirable combination, Ismet Pasha not always being merely the organ of execution of reforms, but sometimes at any rate, being even more thorough-going than his chief.

Izzettin Pasha.

Early history unknown. Commanded the Ist Army Corps at the Sakaria battles, 1922. In July 1923 was elected Deputy for Aydin, but resigned his seat in October 1924 on opting for military duties. In June 1925 became inspector-general of the IIIrd Army. In August 1926 was promoted general of division, and in 1930 full general. Is a member of the Supreme War Council.

Kâzim Pasha.

Born at Diyarbekir in 1879. Educated at the military school. 1904–8 employed at the Ministry of War. 1909–12, and again 1913–14, military attaché at Rome. 1915 Chief of Staff of the Ist Army at the Dardanelles, under Liman von Sanders, whom he accompanied throughout the war, and finally to Palestine. In November 1918 became director of the Military Council. Showed no violent anti-Ally feelings during the armistice, and in June 1920, after joining in an effort to secure a reconciliation between Angora and Constantinople, joined Mustafa Kemal, though at the time expressing the continuation of his sympathy with Great Britain. In October 1920 was appointed Director-General of Administration of the Kemalist Western Army, and in October 1921 Under-Secretary of National Defence. In 1922–23 was in command of the Turkish troops on the Çanak front. In October 1924 succeeded Cevat Pasha as an inspector of the IIIrd Army. In the spring of 1925 was in charge of the troops for the suppression of the Kurdish revolt, and in June resigned his military inspectorate. In August 1926 became Vali of Samsun. In November 1930 was forced to resign and summoned to Angora because of his impartial attitude during the municipal elections at Samsun, which resulted in the victory of all the Liberal party candidates.

Kâzim Pasha was highly esteemed by Liman von Sanders, and is an industrious, well-trained and efficient officer. He is not a political intriguer, has moderate views and has never expressed a preference for any particular party. At Samsun he earned a reputation for energy and efficiency. He is friendly with foreigners, and was held in high esteem by the foreign colony at Samsun.

Kâzim Pasha, Koprulü.

Born at Veles (Köprülü) about 1884. Has followed a military career, and was early a staunch adherent of the Committee of Union and Progress. Held various commands in the eastern vilayets, and during the war was Director-General of Administration to Ali Fuat Pasha. In July 1919 was in command of troops at Balikesir, and there worked for the Nationalist cause. In the autumn raised irregular bands round Bandirma to support Mustafa Kemal, who appointed him Governor of the Balikesir area in January 1920. In June was given command on the northern front, and, after the battle of the Sakarya, was promoted Pasha, becoming, in the following month, January 1922, Minister of National Defence. Held this post till November 1924, when he became President of the Assembly. In August 1926 was promoted to be divisional general of the first class. Following the general election in September 1927, at which he was again returned for Karasi (Balikesir), he was in November re-elected President of the Assembly, and has been re-elected each succeeding year.

Kâzim Pasha is fairly well educated and speaks a little French. He is considered to be tenacious though reasonable, but he does not strike one as a strong character. Has poor health. Is anti-German and anti-Bolshevik, and during the Nationalist struggle made it clear that he was anti-Greek as distinct from anti-Ally. Is influential, but not an attractive personality. A keen poker player.

Kâzim Pasha, Mehmet.

Born about 1883. Fought in Turco-Italian and Balkan Wars, also in Great War in Austria (commanded a brigade against the Russians at Przemysl), at Gallipoli and Erzerum. At the armistice was Chief of Staff of IXth (Caucasus) Army. Was in charge of the division which captured General Tricoupis in the War of Independence. In 1925 he became Sub-Chief of the Turkish General Staff. Was promoted general of division in 1926, and in November 1928 was the chief of the Turkish military mission then sent to Afghanistan, but the mission came to nothing owing to the collapse of Amanullah. Given command of IVth Army Corps in June 1929. Now Inspector-General of Gendarmerie.

Kâzim Pasha has a precise manner of speaking, but is pleasant and reasonable. Supposed to be rather hidebound as regards military matters. He is married to a sister of the late Enver Pasha. Probably anti-Russian and pro-German. A great friend of Kemalettin Sami Pasha, Turkish Ambassador at Berlin.

Kâzim Karabekir Pasha.

Born at Bitolis (Monastir) in 1878 of poor parents. Has throughout his life followed a military career. Held numerous staff appointments during the war. Immediately after the armistice was given command of the XVth Army Corps at Erzerum, where, in 1919, he established contact with Mustafa Kemal, definitely joining the latter in September. In 1919–20 was responsible for the consolidation of the Nationalist position in the eastern vilayets and for the repression of the Armenians. At the same time, was closely in touch with Bolshevik agents. Was throughout inclined to act independently of Angora, and for a time his relations with Mustafa Kemal were strained. In September 1921 represented Turkey at the Kars Conference, when he incurred the displeasure of Angora by adopting too conciliatory an attitude towards the Bolsheviks, and also, probably, because of his great influence in the eastern provinces. In 1922 was given full powers there, and for a time was in touch with Enver Pasha. Finally arrived at Angora in October 1922, and, after being for a time unemployed, probably owing to the jealousy of Mustafa Kemal, became one of the military inspectors. Elected Deputy for Constantinople in 1923, he resigned his military duties in October 1924. Joined the Opposition, resigned from the People's party in November, when he became president of the new Progressive party, which was suppressed in March 1925. He continued his opposition activities, and in July 1926 was arrested and tried at Smyrna for participation in the alleged plot against the Gazi, but was acquitted, probably owing to his influence with the army, which it was later stated wished to make him the leader of an opposition movement. Ceased to be a Deputy in September 1927, and was severely criticised in the Gazi's lengthy review of the revolution in October 1927. Since then little has been heard of him, though his influence, particularly with the army, still remains considerable. Was proposed as an Independent candidate for Istanbul in 1931, but not elected as his candidature was vetoed by the Popular party.

Colonel Rawlinson says: "Kâzim Karabekir Pasha is the best example of a first-class Turkish officer that I have met. Any army under him will be well commanded." Possessed of a naturally quick and bright intelligence, he is master of every branch of his profession, and most conscientious in the performance of his duties. Is straightforward, and much of the Nationalist success was due to his competent handling of the eastern army.

Kemalettin Sami Pasha.

Was a major in the early days of the armistice, later becoming chief director of Nationalist activities in Constantinople and one of Mustafa Kemal's most devoted workers. In 1922 commanded the IVth Army and in 1923 was elected Deputy for Sinop, but resigned Deputyship in October 1924, in consequence of his appointment as Ambassador at Berlin. Became popular there as a characteristically frank soldier and ardent pro-German, who spent much of his time visiting German industrial institutions. Was promoted a general of division in 1926, retaining his post as Ambassador at Berlin.

Kemalettin Sami Pasha poses as a blunt soldier with no little scorn for most countries except his own, Germany and Russia. He was once very anti-British as a result of his experiences during the armistice, but it is understood that at Berlin he has manifested no anti-British bias. He speaks good German and fair French, and his wife (a niece of the ex-Khedive, Abbas Hilmi Pasha) is pleasant and speaks excellent English.

Kiliç Ali Bey.

Born about 1882. Before and during the war was an n.c.o. In 1919 he organised a tough lot of bashi-bozuks at Balikesir. Next heard of in Cilicia in 1920–21, when he acted with great energy against the Armenians, thereby earning the sobriquet of "Kiliç" (sword). At the same time changed his name from Asaf to Ali, and became Deputy for Ayintap, which he still represents in the Assembly. In July 1924 assaulted Celal Nuri Bey with impunity in his office, and two months later accompanied Mustafa Kemal on his tour of the eastern provinces, an association much criticised at the time. Continued, however, to be one of the chief associates of the Gazi, and in March 1925 became a member of the Angora Independence Tribunal. In February 1927 wounded Salih Bey in a brawl arising out of the Swedish railway contract. The

independence tribunals having been suppressed in March Kiliç Ali devoted himself to his numerous commercial activities till the summer, when he was in attendance on the Gazi at Constantinople. In November was a member of the Turkish mission sent to Moscow in connexion with the Russian revolution anniversary celebrations, and in the same month became a member of the executive bureau of the People's party and of the Defence Commission of the Assembly. Is a member of the board of the Iş Bankasi.

Kiliç Ali Bey's character is clear from his record. He is a brute and a bully, with no apparent compensating features. He is, however, influential, owing to his friendship with the Gazi, though outwardly at least that friendship seems to be subject to a good deal of ebb and flow.

Mahmut Bey.

Born about 1880. At one time before the war was tutor to one of the Imperial Princes. An army officer, he occupied his spare time in writing or translating military text books. Was an A.D.C. to Mustafa Kemal in the independence war. Since 1923 has been Deputy for Siirt. By 1926 had become chief editor of the semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" (Angora), and "Milliyet" (Constantinople); was a member of the executive bureau of the People's party and president of the fifth section of the Assembly. In November 1927 he became reporter of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, and in the same month was a member of the Turkish mission sent to Moscow for the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Russian revolution. Went to Paris and London, and was much pleased with his reception in London. He is also vice-president of the Turkish Aviation League and chairman of the board of the Iş Bankasi. Was a member of the Turkish delegation at the Second Balkan Conference, held at Constantinople in October 1931.

Mahmut Bey is one of the leading journalists in Turkey and the President's man of business. Is very influential, but not much seen in public. Speaks French well and is capable. Appearance is very oriental, of an almost negroid type.

Mahmut Esat Bey.

Born at Smyrna in 1886. Studied law in Constantinople and Switzerland, obtaining his degree in Fribourg in 1911. In 1912 established himself in Smyrna as a lawyer, and remained obscurely there till 1919. In May 1920 went to Angora, and in the following month was appointed Deputy for Smyrna and still retains this seat. In May 1922 published a violent article against the Sublime Porte and the Sultan, and in June became secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In July became Minister of Economics, holding the post till September 1923, when he retired to Smyrna and was understood to have become an Oppositionist. In March 1924 opposed the grant of veto and dissolution powers to the President of the Republic. In November became Minister of Justice, retaining this portfolio when Ismet Pasha reconstructed his Cabinet in November 1927. In August–September 1926 Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs during the absence of Tevfik Rüştü Bey at Geneva. In 1926 and 1927 he made several visits to Europe in connexion with the "Lotus" question, and was chief Turkish delegate before The Hague Tribunal in the summer of 1927, when the Turkish case was upheld. In 1930 became increasingly unpopular, and was accused of influencing the course of justice. His position became gradually weaker during the summer, and he was one of the chief objects of attack of Fethi Bey and the new Liberal party. Was not included in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet as reformed in September 1930 and in May 1931. In October 1931 published in a Smyrna newspaper a series of violent articles against freemasonry.

Mahmut Esat Bey speaks French and German as well as Turkish and Greek. He is considered to be one of the best Turkish specialists in Constitutional Law. He showed great energy in the introduction of Criminal, Commercial and Civil Codes based on Western models, of which the last-named has revolutionised Turkish family life.

Muhlis Bey.

Born in Constantinople about 1887. Graduate of Halkali Agricultural School in 1911. Taught there 1911–16. Sent by Turkish Government to Germany for special course of study, and on his return resumed position as

teacher at Halkali School. Was employed for a time as adviser in Ministry of National Economy, returning later to the agricultural school, where he specialised in the subject of milk. Still later became rector of the school, and was Under-Secretary for Agriculture in 1926 and 1927. In the latter year was elected Deputy for Brusa and member of the Budget Commission of the Assembly, of which he became *rapporteur* in 1928. In 1931 was elected Deputy for Kütahya and secretary of the Budget Commission. In December 1931 was appointed to the newly-created post of Minister of Agriculture.

Münür Bey, Mehmet.

Born about 1875. Educated at the Mülkiye College and Law School at Constantinople. After obtaining his diploma of doctor of law, was appointed one of the assistant legal advisers of the Sublime Ports, holding this post till 1916, when he became chief legal adviser. As such attended the conference of Brzesć (Brest-Litovsk). Accompanied Izzet Pasha on the reconciliation mission to Anatolia in December 1920. At once placed his services at the disposal of the Nationalist Government, and became legal adviser. Was Turkish legal adviser at the Lausanne Conference, and returned to hold the post at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs till February 1925, when he was appointed Turkish Minister at Berne. Became Ambassador at Paris in August 1930.

Münür Bey is a pretty good lawyer and rather the simple old-fashioned kind of Turkish official. He has a reputation for honesty, and created a good impression on the British delegates at the Lausanne Conference.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

Born in 1880 at Salonica, son of an Albanian father and Turkish mother. Had an entirely Turkish upbringing, and was educated at the Mülkiye school at Salonica and at the military college in Constantinople, from which he passed out with the rank of captain in 1905. In 1907 he was for a time exiled to Damascus. Receiving a staff appointment at Salonica, he early joined the Committee of Union and Progress, and was at Salonica when the Constitution was proclaimed. Soon after quarrelled with the Committee of Union and Progress. 1910–11 served in Tripoli; 1913 became aide-de-camp to the Heir Apparent and military attaché at Sofia. In October 1914 was given a command at Gallipoli and distinguished himself at Anafarta in 1915, when he alone saved the situation in defiance of Von Sanders's orders. Later in the same year he fell foul of Enver and remained unemployed till 1917, when he was given a Caucasus command. In 1917–18 had twice command of the VIIth Army on the Palestine front, but quarrelled in turn with Von Falkenhayn, Liman von Sanders and Enver. In May 1919 was sent to Anatolia to stem the rising tide of nationalism, and on his arrival at Samsun immediately assumed leadership of the movement. On the 18th July announced his resignation from the army and devotion to the Nationalist cause, and on the 27th summoned the first Nationalist Congress at Erzerum. In November summoned the second Nationalist Congress at Sivas, and in December at Angora. During the following months he tried to dictate to the Constantinople Government and in April 1920 established an independent Government at Angora. In May became President of the First Assembly and proceeded to organise the Nationalist army. In 1921 received Russian and Afghan Ambassadors at Angora, and in November was vested with absolute authority for the prosecution of the war. Early in 1922 had some difficulties with Assembly, but his dictatorship was successively prolonged for limited periods, and with the Nationalist victory over the Greeks in August–September his ascendency was complete. In November secured from the Assembly the abolition of the Sultanate. This step gave rise to opposition in the Assembly, and he dismissed it in April 1923. In the following election Kemalist nominees were to a large extent elected, Mustafa Kemal himself becoming one of the Deputies for Angora. In August was re-elected President of the Assembly, and in October, on the emergence of a Cabinet crisis, had a republic proclaimed with himself as President. Early in March 1924 decreed the abolition of the Caliphate, though in the same month the right of veto was refused to him, while in April the supreme command of the army in time of peace was vested in the Chief of the General Staff. Since that time the President has inspired the policy of the Government, and in all essentials controlled the Administration through his nominees. Though in many respects his policy is

but a continuation of that of the Committee of Union and Progress, the drive which has put the recent great innovations through has been mainly his own. In August 1925 he divorced his wife, Latife Hanim, whom he had married in 1922, and in the same month he decreed the abolition of the fez. During the summer of 1926 a plot to assassinate him was "discovered" at Smyrna, and as a result a number of Opposition leaders were hanged. Early in 1927 his health showed signs of giving way, and he moderated his manner of life. He was also seen much more in public and his behaviour became more decorous. In the summer, after an absence of eight years, he at last visited Constantinople, and from there controlled the general election in September, at which only his nominees were returned. In October he made further history by delivering a six-day speech before a party congress, in which he reviewed the whole course of the Turkish revolution. In the following month he was unanimously re-elected President of the Republic.

In May 1928 the King of Afghanistan paid him an official visit in Angora, being the first head of a foreign State to do so. As in 1927, the summer was spent at Constantinople and was followed by an extensive provincial tour during which the campaign for the reform of the alphabet was launched, and the Gazi—a title assumed after the victory over the Greeks—earned the sobriquet of "Professor in Chief." In the autumn of 1930 his position became delicate owing to his having encouraged the formation of the new Liberal party by Fethi Bey, who had to dissolve it some months later. Started on a prolonged tour of the provinces in November to investigate abuses and hear complaints. Re-elected President of the Republic by the Fourth Grand National Assembly, May 1931.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha is about 5ft. 7in. tall, with a sallow complexion and steel grey eyes with a fixed expression. Has strong regular features and is now inclined to stoutness. Possesses an impressive delivery in speech-making, but has little personal magnetism. He is a driver rather than leader of men, is jealous of superior brains, and can brook no opposition, as the record of his life shows. From his early days he has been an excessive drinker, and is still given to excesses. Is, however, possessed of an iron will and constitution.

Mustafa Seref Bey.

Born in Burdur in 1884. A graduate of the faculty of law of Constantinople and Paris. Was director of the Law School at Konya, professor of the Turkish University, Under-Secretary of the Ministry of Commerce, under the Imperial régime. Elected Deputy for Burdur. Took part in the Lausanne Conference. Lately one of the Turkish delegates for the negotiation of commercial treaties. Appointed Minister of National Economy in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, September 1930, and retained his portfolio in new Ministry, May 1931.

The toughest, because the ablest and best-informed, of the commercial treaty negotiators, and can become bitter under the influence of controversy, but at other times displays a genial if shy bearing.

Naci Pasha.

Born at Bitolj (Monastir). Passed out of Constantinople Military School with rank of second lieutenant of infantry in 1893, and went to Germany for a course of military studies. Teacher of military manœuvres from 1897 to 1909. Commanded school for reserve officers at Beylerbey until its suppression in 1912. In February 1913 appointed director of studies at the Constantinople Military School. In February 1915 was made director of the training camp at Erzerum, and in 1917 joined the General Staff of the Caucasus armies. In July 1918 appointed personal A.D.C. to the Sultan (Mehmet VI Vahidettin), and retained the post until April 1920, though in sympathy with the Nationalist movement, for which reason he fell foul of the Grand Vizier Damat Ferit. Accompanied Salih Pasha on his mission to Anatolia, and joined Mustafa Kemal. In 1924 was head of a military mission to Britain, France and Poland. In May–June 1925 was in command of the Government forces at Diyarbekir for the repression of the Kurdish revolt of Sheikh Sait. In 1927 commanded the Vth Army Corps at Konya and was promoted Divisional General. In 1928 made the arrangements for King Amanullah's visit to Angora, and was to have gone to Afghanistan as military adviser, but Kâzim Pasha was sent instead. Thereupon resigned

from the army, and was elected Deputy for Cebelibereket. Was president of the National Defence Commission of the Assembly from November 1928 to November 1930, and is a member of the same commission since the latter date. Re-elected Deputy for Cebelibereket, April 1931.

Naci Pasha is short, very dapper, possessed of pleasant but very formal manners and a refined and charming wife. Speaks French and excellent German.

Necmettin Sadik Bey.

Born about 1890. Owner and chief editor of the "Akşam" newspaper, published at Constantinople. Elected Deputy for Sivas in September 1927, and member of the Public Instruction Commission of the Assembly in November. Was one of the Turkish delegates to the International Press Conference at Cologne in May 1928, and in November was elected member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, a position which he still retains. Early in 1929 his paper published an attack on His Majesty's Ambassador on account of sympathy shown with the sufferers from a fire at Kurtuluş (Tatavla), a Greek quarter of Constantinople, but later gave equal publicity to an explanation by Sir George Clerk. In November 1930 he accompanied as journalist the Turkish delegation to the Preliminary Disarmament Conference at Geneva. Accompanied Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüstü Bey on their official visit to Athens, October 1931, and on his return was one of the Turkish delegates at the Second Balkan Conference, held at Constantinople.

Necmettin Sadik Bey speaks French and has pleasant manners.

Numan (Rifat) Bey, Menemenli.

Born in 1890, a son of Menemenli Zade Rifat Bey, ex-President of the Ottoman Senate, and on his mother's side a relative of Namik Kemal Bey. After passing through Galata Saray College, went to Switzerland in 1913 to study jurisprudence. On the outbreak of war entered the Harbiye College as a cadet, but through his father's influence obtained in February 1915 the post of third secretary at the Turkish Embassy in Vienna. Transferred in 1916 to Berne, where he remained until transferred to The Hague some years after the war. Appointed first secretary at Athens in 1926, and in August transferred to Budapest as Chargé d'Affaires. After serving for a time as consul-general at Beirut, was in June 1928 appointed Director-General of the First Division at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Appointed Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in June 1929, in which post he completed the work of reorganisation initiated by his predecessor, Enis Bey. Was in Germany for treatment during greater part of 1931.

Numan Bey is slight, somewhat stooped, dark-haired and sallow-complexioned. Has very indifferent health. Quiet and retiring, but very intelligent and efficient, friendly and straightforward. Speaks excellent French, and plays a good game of bridge. Married a French-Swiss lady, now deceased.

Nuri Bey, Mehmet.

Born about 1880.

A former military attaché at The Hague. Was with Mustafa Kemal at Tripoli in 1911 and became his personal friend. Earlier history unknown. Elected Deputy for Kütahya in 1923, and again in 1927. In 1926-27 was a member of the Executive Bureau of the Popular party, and was elected to the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly in 1927 and 1928. In August 1930 joined Fethi Bey's new Liberal Republican party, somewhat against the Gazi's wishes, and acted as its secretary-general until the dissolution of the party in November, when he was appointed a member of the Administrative Council of the Is Bankasi (Business Bank). Again seen a good deal with the Gazi in October and November 1931, when the press announced that he had applied for and obtained readmission to the Popular party.

Nuri Bey is tall, substantially built, and by no means forthcoming. Is a hard drinker, and until he joined the Liberal Republican party was one of the Gazi's most intimate and constant companions, and, as such, probably exercised a certain amount of influence. Owns house property at Angora.

Nusret Bey.

Born about 1878 of South Albanian origin. Educated at the Mülkiye College at Constantinople, after which he followed a course of jurisprudence at the law school. In 1903 became a clerk in the Legal Adviser's Department at the Sublime Porte. In 1916 became director of this Department. In 1921 accompanied Tevfik Pasha's delegation to London in the capacity of legal adviser. Was in the Turkish delegation at Lausanne. Continued to share with Münür Bey the duties of legal adviser of the Angora Government until 1924, when he was appointed representative in Constantinople of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. As such he was always ready to take reasonable views, and in so far as his limited powers allowed him, he was helpful. In June 1927 he resigned his Constantinople appointment on being appointed President of the newly-constituted Council of State. In 1931 was appointed chairman of the Board of Central Bank of the Republic—the State Bank.

Nusret Bey gives lectures at the law school on international law, on which he is regarded as something of an authority. Is of a very quiet and studious disposition and his chief pleasure consists in the perusal of legal works in French. Is personable and courteous, but in Constantinople his bugbear was social functions in Pera. His womenfolk remain in seclusion.

Nusret Sadullah Bey.

Born about 1875, the son of Sadullah Pasha, at one time Ambassador and Minister for Foreign Affairs. Studied at the Galata Saray College, Constantinople, and at Vienna. Entered the diplomatic service, and served at Berlin and Vienna, until about 1900, when he became assistant legal adviser to the Sublime Porte. Owing to bad health was for some years unemployed, but in July 1913, after having been a Deputy for a few months, he became Minister in Belgium and afterwards at The Hague, where he remained until 1923. In 1925 he became head of the Political Section of the Foreign Ministry, but resigned in 1926 for reasons of health. In September 1927 became Deputy for Samsun, and two months later member of the Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission. Appointed Minister at Belgrade in February 1928, he resigned his deputyship, but was re-elected in October, ill-health having made it impossible for him to take up his new diplomatic post. Re-elected member of Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly in November 1930. Not re-elected to the Assembly in April 1931.

Nusret Sadullah Bey is cultured and very popular, both in European and Turkish circles. He is also capable, but his poor health—a hereditary weakness, both his father and brother having committed suicide during fits of temporary insanity—has prevented him from attaining the distinction to which he would otherwise appear entitled. Was married to an Egyptian Princess, now deceased, the daughter of the late Abbas Halim Pasha. Has recently married an attractive Turkish lady, very much younger than himself. Is not a politician.

Ragip Raif Bey.

Born in 1874, the son of Raif Pasha. Entered Turkish Foreign Office in 1897, went to London in 1901 and later to Berne, Brussels, Washington and again London, where he was counsellor in 1914. Remained in Europe during the war, and after it was Minister at Madrid. In 1927 became political adviser at Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and in January 1929 was appointed Chargé d'Affaires at Stockholm, Oslo, Copenhagen and Helsingfors. Appointed Chargé d'Affaires at Tokyo in July 1931.

Ragip Raif Bey shows distinct traces of Arab blood, and has a somewhat coarse appearance. Speaks English well, and is a good talker, but is addicted to drink, and when in liquor often indulges in indiscretions, which are generally amusing and sometimes interesting.

Rahmi Bey, Mustafa.

Born about 1880 at Smyrna. Nothing known of his early history, except that for a time he was a finance official. Since 1923 has been a Deputy for Smyrna. Became Minister of Commerce in May 1926, and in November 1927, on the reconstruction of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet, retained that portfolio, combining with it that of Agriculture. Was not a success in this post, owing to complete lack of business capacity. Resigned on grounds of ill-health in May 1929.

Elected member of the Economic Affairs and Accounts Commission of the Assembly in November 1930, and chairman of that commission in November 1931.

Rahmi Bey is a big, burly man, who speaks nothing but Turkish. He rarely shows himself in public, but officially is courteous and helpful.

Rana Bey, Ali.

Born in 1883 at Constantinople and educated at Galata Saray School. Studied wireless telegraphy in Europe, and was employed in the Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs until 1920, subsequently taking up private commercial and agricultural work. Was one of the founders of a modern cotton factory in Turkey. In 1926 was a member of the Constantinople Municipal Council, and in September 1927 was elected Deputy for Samsun, becoming in November a member of the Internal Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In June 1928 he was one of the Turkish delegates to the Inter-Parliamentary Congress at Paris, was in November elected President of the Finance Commission of the Assembly, and about the same time became a member of the Executive Bureau of the People's party. In the summer of 1929 he represented Turkey at the Universal Postal Congress held in London, and during his stay in England visited several Manchester cotton mills under the auspices of the Department of Overseas Trade. Having been returned as Deputy for Constantinople in April 1931, he was soon afterwards elected vice-president of the Budget Commission of the Assembly, and in October was a member of the Turkish delegation at the Second Balkan Conference, held at Constantinople. At the end of December he was appointed to the newly-created post of Minister of Customs and Monopolies.

Rana Bey, who speaks a little English, harbours grateful memories of the numerous official attentions which he received during his visit to London in 1929.

Recep Bey (Mehmet).

Born about 1880. An ex-army officer. In 1922 became secretary-general of the People's party, and as such had considerable power. July 1923, Deputy for Kütahya. May 1924, became Minister of Interior and resigned from the secretaryship of the People's party. In the autumn of 1924 was considered one of the leading men of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet and a likely candidate for the premiership, but was maintained in his post on Fethi Bey becoming Prime Minister in November. In January 1925 resigned owing to his objections to the Cabinet proposal to appoint prefects by election, and resumed his post as secretary-general of the People's party until, in March, on the return of Ismet Pasha to power, he became Minister for National Defence. Early in 1927 his influence was said to be on the wane. He was re-elected Deputy for Kütahya in 1927 (again in 1931), but ceased to hold ministerial rank when Ismet Pasha reconstructed his Cabinet in November, and a few days later became chairman of the Defence Commission of the Assembly. October 1928 became Minister of Public Works, but was not reappointed on re-formation of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet in September 1930. In March 1931 again became secretary-general of the People's party.

Recep Bey was unknown until the later years of the Nationalist struggle, and owed his position to his friendship with the President of the Republic. A big, burly figure, he is said to be ambitious, with a perpetual desire to become Prime Minister. He is, however, something of an extremist.

Refet Pasha.

Born in 1877 at Trnovo. 1898–1908 was employed in the gendarmerie in Macedonia. Commanded the gendarmerie battalion of the Army of Liberation in 1908. Went to the staff school in 1911, and was sent to Damascus in 1912. Became famous as the defender of Gaza in 1916, and 1918 received the command of the XXIIIrd Army Corps in Palestine. At the armistice was appointed commander-in-chief of the gendarmerie, and in May 1919 commander of the IIIrd Army Corps at Sivas. Landed at Samsun with Mustafa Kemal, and immediately became one of the latter's chief lieutenants. In September commanded the Nationalist forces at Konya, and in March 1920 was appointed commander on the Aydin front. In September was appointed Minister of the Interior, holding the post till April 1921. After holding various commands, was Minister of National Defence from July 1921 to January 1922. After the Mudanya Conference was appointed Governor of Thrace, but remained in Constantinople, where he rapidly overthrew the Sultan's Government and established Nationalist authority. In July 1923 elected Deputy for Constantinople, and soon afterwards resigned his appointment, which no longer had any *raison d'être*. In the autumn began to show Opposition tendencies over the proclamation of the republic, and was in close touch with the Caliph and Rauf Bey. Resigned his deputyship in May 1924 and thereafter lived quietly in Constantinople, though maintaining close touch with Rauf and other Opposition leaders. In October withdrew his resignation of the deputyship, publicly joined forces with the Oppositionists, resigned from the People's party and became one of the leaders of the new Progressive party. In July 1926 was tried at Angora for participation in the alleged plot against the life of the President of the Republic, but was acquitted supposedly because of his prestige with the army. In October he announced his abandonment of political life, and in November finally resigned his deputyship. In 1931 he visited Angora and it was rumoured that he was to return to political life. Later he was put forward as independent candidate for Istanbul at the parliamentary elections, but his candidature was vetoed by the Popular party and came to nothing.

Refet Pasha is one of the most able of the Nationalist leaders and of considerable political ability. In 1922, at Constantinople, showed himself to be an extremely keen and clever tactician. Though his private life is not above reproach, he can hardly fail to play a prominent part in any future Opposition movement in Turkey.

Refik Bey, Dr.

Born about 1878. Studied at Stambul medical school and in Germany, and later practised medicine. Was an early supporter of Mustafa Kemal, and from 1921 to 1923 was Deputy for Beyazit in the first Angora Assembly. Since 1923 has been one of the Deputies for Constantinople. Except for the period November 1924 to March 1925, when Fethi Bey was Prime Minister, Refik Bey has been Minister of Health since October 1923. He has discharged the duties of his post with marked ability, and the great improvement in Turkish sanitary conditions and the successful draining of the Angora marshes are outstanding tributes to his ability and energy. His Ministry is easily the most efficient of all the Turkish official Departments. Is chairman of the Administrative Committee of the Turkish Red Crescent. Paid official visits to the United States of America and London in 1929. In October 1931 was acting Prime Minister during Ismet Pasha's official visit to Athens and Budapest.

Generally known as "Doktor Bey," Refik Bey is rotund and beaming, behind his enormous spectacles, and is universally popular. Not much seen in public, he is particularly fond of bridge, at which he is an indifferent player. Speaks fair French. Is unconcerned with politics, and is almost exclusively taken up with his work. Is probably a martinet in his Department. Is now, unfortunately, in poor health.

Resit Galip Bey.

Born about 1887 in Rhodes. Studied at the medical school, Constantinople, and later followed medical courses in France and Switzerland. Joined the Young Turks' movement on his return, and afterwards held numerous posts as an official doctor. Was municipal doctor at Mersin during the French occupation. Has been Deputy for Aydin since January 1925, and from March 1925 till its suppression in March 1927 was a member of the Angora Independence Tribunal. Was understood in 1926 to have insisted on the hanging of Cavit Bey against the opinion of his colleagues. Is a member of the Executive Council of the People's party and secretary of the Public Health Commission of the Assembly. In August 1930 joined the new Liberal party on its formation, but later declared himself to be an independent and soon reverted to the People's party. In April 1931 was re-elected for Aydin. In September attended International Conference at Geneva for the Protection of Children.

Resit Galip Bey is of rather a good type and pleasant in conversation, but is showing signs of coarsening. He is a brother of Hüseyn Ragip Bey, the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow.

Reşit Saffet Bey.

Born at Constantinople about 1883. Began life as translator in the Tobacco Régie. Later entered the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and was secretary in the Legations at Bucharest, Washington, Madrid and Tehran. During this period became a member of the C.U.P. On the outbreak of the Revolution of 1908 was appointed Director of the Private Council of the Ministry of Finance and became secretary to the Minister, Cavit Bey, who at various times sent him as propagandist agent to London, Paris, Rome, and, particularly during the Great War, Vienna and Berlin. On the signature of the armistice in 1918 became counsellor of the Turkish Legation at Berne, where he engaged in pan-Islamic agitation and wrote anti-British articles in the local press. On his return to Constantinople in October 1919 opened a branch of the Swiss Society for the Defence of Ottoman Rights, and became one of the directors of pan-Islamic activity. Later he turned to pan-Turanianism, and became one of the most indefatigable discoverers of affinities between the Turkish race and the principal civilised peoples of the world. Worked for the extreme wing of the Nationalist party, but in 1921 lost the favour of Mustafa Kemal for a time. In October 1922 was appointed secretary-general of the Turkish Peace Delegation at Lausanne. In 1925 was adviser to Turkish delegate for the liquidation of the International Board of Health, and showed himself pugnacious and occasionally insolent. Made grave accusations against the British delegate and was obliged to resign. Elected Deputy for Izmit in September 1927, and member of the Commerce Commission of the Assembly in November. In June 1928 was one of the Turkish delegates to the International Inter-Parliamentary Congress at Paris, and visited Russia in 1929, returning much impressed by his experiences. In October 1930 he went as member of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan Congress at Athens, and in January 1931 to the Balkan Conference at Salonica. Is president of the Turkish Touring Club, in which capacity he has done much to secure the abolition of some of the more troublesome restrictions on the movement of foreigners, and, since November 1930, a member of the Finance Commission of the Assembly. In the autumn of 1931 represented Turkey at Orientalists' Congress at Leyden and Parliamentary Congress at Bucharest, and was one of the Turkish delegates at the Second Balkan Conference held in Constantinople.

Reşit Saffet Bey speaks French and understands German. Is well versed in finance and very ambitious. Has been described as a man of no character, and is not above making improper advances, when under the influence of liquor, to distinguished female visitors.

Ruşen Eşref Bey.

Born in 1893 at Constantinople. Before the war taught in the English boys' school in Constantinople. Was associated with Mustafa Kemal from the inception of the Nationalist movement and was a member of the first Angora Assembly. Has been a Deputy for Afyon Karahisar since 1923. Has never occupied any prominent official position, but has for years been one of the Gazi's most intimate friends. 1925–27, was secretary of the Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission, and for the last four years has been the chief secretary of the Assembly. In the summer of 1927 he represented the Turkish press at an international congress in London, whence he returned deeply impressed by English education, industry and culture. In June 1928 was a delegate to the International Parliamentary Congress in Paris, and on his return took a prominent part in the campaign for the reform of the alphabet. Was one of the Turkish delegates at the Balkan Congress at Athens in October 1930, and secretary of the Balkan Conference at Constantinople a year later

Ruşen Eşref Bey is an attractive personality. He is cultured and speaks remarkably well. Has read extensively and is extremely intelligent, but is probably constitutionally lazy, and, though fond of writing and gifted with great fluency, tends to work in spurts. Has lately been engaged on translating standard Western authors. While accused by some of insincerity, he is excellent company, is very fond of bridge, and has a pleasant wife, whose comparative good looks and other attractions place her in the forefront of the ladies in Angora society.

Sabri Bey, Mehmet.

Born about 1883. Before the war was a small post office employee. During the war was secretary-general of the Committee of Union and Progress, and for

his activities in this connexion was deported to Malta in 1919. He returned, and became in 1922 Director of Posts and Telegraphs at Angora, and went to Germany, where he studied wireless In July 1923 elected Deputy for Saruhan (Manisa), and in August became first Vice-President of the Assembly. In March 1925 became Minister for Agriculture. He was re-elected Deputy in September 1927, but ceased to hold office in November on the suppression of the Ministry of Agriculture as a separate Department. In the same month he became a member of the Assembly Budget Commission, and in November 1928 chairman of the Assembly Accounts Commission. In February 1929 was appointed Minister at Bucharest, but resigned in 1930 in order to become a Deputy again. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan Congress at Athens in October 1930, and next month was elected member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. Was a member of the Turkish delegation at the Second Balkan Conference held at Constantinople in October 1931.

Sabri Bey has a rough but genial manner. He has great ideas about developing agriculture in Turkey. In November 1925, during a visit to Moscow, he gave evidence of strong pro-Russian sentiments.

Saffet (Ziya) Bey.

Born about 1885. A former staff colonel. Was on the staff of Izzet Pasha in the Yemen in 1912. During the war served at Gallipoli and in Mesopotamia. In 1920 was military attaché at Moscow. In July 1923 elected Deputy for Izmit. From March 1925 until March 1931 was secretary-general of the People's party, and as such exercised much power and influence. He had complete control over the party, and was responsible for the arrangements for the complete success of the Kemalist nominees in the general election of September 1927, he himself being returned for Erzincan. Since November 1927 he has been president of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, and in the same month he headed a Turkish mission to Moscow for the celebrations in connexion with the tenth anniversary of the Soviet revolution. From there went on to Paris and London. In the autumn of 1930 and winter of 1931 was busily engaged in reorganising the Popular party. Appointed head of Department in Council of State in 1931.

Saffat Bey is probably a *dönme* (Islamised Jew), and is extremely capable, but is possibly just as untrustworthy. He is, however, friendly and sociable and a good bridge player. A close friend of the Gazi, he is very ambitious, and may be expected to go far.

Salih Bey.

Born in 1881. Passed through the Military School and was a great friend of Mustafa Kemal, both then and after. Was with him at Tripoli in 1911. Joined the Nationalist movement at the outset and became chief A.D.C. to the President. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Yozgat, and continued to be one of the Gazi's boon companions. In 1926 began to show nervousness regarding the future. In March 1927 was involved in a brawl with Kilič Ali Bey arising out of baksheesh for Swedish railway concession, and was shot in the leg. By this time his influence was on the wane. In June he suddenly returned to favour and was in close attendance on the Gazi at Constantinople during the summer, as also during the summer of 1928. Re-elected Deputy for Yozgat in September 1927, and since November of that year has been a member of the National Defence Commission of the Assembly. In April 1931 elected Deputy for Ertuğrul (Bilecik).

Salih Bey speaks only Turkish, but is pleasant to talk to. Is a hard drinker.

Suat Bey.

Born in 1878. Studied law in Paris, and in 1912 became secretary at the Sublime Porte. Was a protégé of Talat Pasha, and quickly became head of the Consular and Commercial Department. During the armistice was Director-General of Administration at the Porte, but resigned on the fall of Ferit Pasha. In 1923 became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs at Angora, and in 1924 representative at Rome. Appointed Ambassador there in April 1925.

Suat Bey is a somewhat aggressive and tiresome person to deal with.

Şakir Bey.

Born at Veles about 1882. Educated at Constantinople, and early entered the service of the Ministry of Interior. Was for a time secretary of the Adrianople Vilayet and later became Kaymakam of Ardahan. Became Deputy for Gallipoli in 1920, and throughout the armistice was one of the moving spirits of the Kemalist movement in Thrace. In 1921 was the unofficial Kemalist agent in Sofia, but continued to devote most of his attention to the Thracian movement. In October 1922 he was appointed Vali of Adrianople and established the Kemalist Administration there. Early in the following year he transferred his activities to Constantinople, of which he was for a time Vali. Has been Deputy for Adrianople since 1923, and for the last three years chairman of the Budget Commission of the Assembly. He is also a member of the executive bureau of the People's party. In May 1929 became Minister of National Economy, but lost the appointment on the reformation of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet in September 1930.

Şakir Bey is a man of wide education, speaks several European languages and has travelled much in Europe. He has some reputation as an administrator, and for the last few years has taken a prominent part in Turkish financial and economic matters, being connected with the Alpullu sugar refinery.

Şerki Bey, Ali.

Born in Constantinople about 1884, the son of a major-domo of Tevfik Pasha, who saw to the education of his retainer's son at the Galata Saray College, and in 1905 secured him a post in the Foreign Ministry. Accompanied Tevfik Pasha on a mission to Vienna, Berlin and St. Petersburg in 1909. Returned to the Ministry and in 1914 became private secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, holding this post throughout the war. Accompanied Tevfik Pasha to the Paris Peace Conference in 1920 and was later in the year appointed Minister at Stockholm. In 1922 was Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs under Izzet Pasha in the last Constantinople Government till the collapse of the latter in November. Angora having need of his services, he was summoned to the capital; in 1925 was head of the Commercial Section of the Foreign Ministry, and in August 1926 became Under-Secretary, holding this post till September 1927, when he was elected Deputy for Tokat. In November he became a member of the Budget Commission of the Assembly. For the last few years he has been chief Turkish delegate for the negotiation of commercial and consular conventions with foreign States. Was not re-elected Deputy in the general election of April 1931, and was soon after appointed chief Turkish delegate on the Græco-Turkish Fixed Exchange Commission.

As his record shows, Şevki Bey owes everything to his venerable patron, Tevfik Pasha. He is short and uninspiring, but has a certain capacity. Became much more expansive and affable after his election as a Deputy. Enjoys imperfect health.

Şükrü Bey, Saracoğlu.

Born about 1885. Nothing known of his early history. Since July 1923 has been a Deputy for Smyrna. December 1923 became president of Foreign Affairs Commission of Assembly. November 1924–March 1925 was Minister of Public Instruction in Fethi Bey's Cabinet. In July 1925 became chief Turkish delegate on the Commission for the Exchange of Populations. In this capacity visited Geneva in December 1926, and in the same month signed the Turco-Greek Convention. In May 1927 he was given charge of negotiations for purchase of Anatolian Railway, which was concluded in December 1928, and in November, when Ismet Pasha reconstructed his Cabinet, he became Minister of Finance. As such, he was intimately concerned in the settlement of the coupons questions in 1928. In 1930 he came in for much criticism in connexion with the Turkish financial crisis, and one of Fethi Bey's principal objects in founding the new Liberal party was to get rid of him as Minister of Finance. In this he failed, but Sükrü Bey resigned in December on account of ill-health. In October 1931 was sent on a special mission to the United States of America ostensibly to get into touch with American business circles, but really in the hope of obtaining American financial co-operation in Turkish public works.

Şükrü Bey is delicate in appearance, and is probably a Moderate. Is believed to be very capable, has plenty of drive, is popular and was on excellent

terms with his Greek opposite number in exchange matters. He has acted as Minister for Foreign Affairs during one of Tevfik Rüştü Bey's numerous absences abroad.

Şükrü Kaya Bey.

Born about 1884 at Kos, where he still owns property. Before the war was an official of the Ministry of Justice, and in 1914, as a civil inspector, accompanied the Embassies' delegates who enquired into the Greek deportations around Smyrna. Was then of advanced ideas and a protégé of Talat Pasha. Was deported to Malta in the early armistice, and on his liberation identified himself with Mustafa Kemal. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the first Lausanne Conference. Mayor of Smyrna in 1923, when he was a failure. In July 1923 elected Deputy for Mentese, which he still represents. In March 1924 charged with deposit of the ratification of the Lausanne Treaty, and went to Paris and Berne. In the same month became president of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In August became Minister of Agriculture, and in November Minister for Foreign Affairs. Resigned in March 1925 and was reappointed president of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, holding this post till the autumn of 1927. During this period he exercised considerable influence over Turkish foreign policy. In November 1927, on the reconstruction of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet, he became Minister of Interior, and quickly effected drastic administrative changes, more particularly in the eastern provinces, where he caused the military régime to be suppressed in December. Was Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs in September–October 1930 during Tevfik Rüştü Bey's official visit to Moscow and again during the latter's official visits to Athens and Budapest in October 1931.

Şükrü Kaya Bey is a coarse but vigorous personality, and is by no means unintelligent. Not too well liked by other leading Turks, who regard him as a *poseur*. Is a hard drinker and an intimate counsellor of the Gazi.

Sükrü Nayli Pasha.

Early history unknown. Elected Deputy for Kirklareli (Kirk Kilise) in 1923. In October of that year was in command of the Turkish troops which entered Constantinople after the Allied evacuation, and has ever since been in command of the IIIrd Army Corps stationed at Constantinople. In October 1924 resigned his deputyship on opting for military duties. Promoted Divisional General in August 1926. Is in command of all the military schools in the Constantinople district.

An intelligent and up-to-date soldier, with pleasant manners and a European outlook.

Tevfik Bey, Colonel.

Born about 1880. Mother a Bagdadi, father a Turk. Left the military school in 1908, and in view of his marked intelligence proceeded direct to the Staff College, whence he graduated in 1912. In 1914 he was appointed to the staff of the 19th Division, where he served under Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Later he served in the Caucasus, and was on the staff of Ismet Pasha in Palestine. Joined the Nationalist movement at the beginning, and was appointed to the General Staff of the Ministry of National Defence, with rank of colonel. Was Turkish military adviser at the Lausanne Conference 1922–23. In June 1924 became secretary to the President of the Republic, and held this post till November 1927, in spite of Ismet Pasha's efforts to appoint him to various missions abroad. He represented Turkey at the Arms Traffic Conference at Geneva in the early summer of 1925. In November 1927 was appointed Ambassador in Moscow, but only remained there till May 1928, when he was at Angora in attendance on the King of Afghanistan, whom he accompanied to Tehran. He there signed the Turco-Persian neutrality protocol, and on his return resumed his duties as private secretary to the President, who refuses to be without him. In November 1930 he was a member of the Turkish delegation at the Geneva Preparatory Disarmament Conference. Is president of the Turkish History Association.

Tevfik Bey is tall, fat and pleasant, and is completely identified with Mustafa Kemal. He speaks German, Russian and French. Always affable, his relations with the British delegates at Lausanne were very cordial. He is married, but keeps his womenkind in comparative seclusion.

Tevfik Kâmil Bey.

Born in 1889 at Salonica and educated there. A career diplomat. Studied law in Paris until 1911, and entered diplomacy after teaching for some time at Stamboul University. He was second secretary to the Turkish delegation at the Second Lausanne Conference in 1923, and on his return to Angora became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. As such he was charged with the negotiations of friendship treaties with several foreign countries, and gradually exercised increasing influence. Resigned in October 1925 on his election as Deputy for Constantinople. In 1926 he became a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, and by his expert knowledge made his influence felt. In 1927 he was responsible for the drafting of a new and very important law on Turkish nationality. Represented Turkey at an International Cattle Plague Conference at Adana in November 1927. Elected one of the quæstors of the Assembly a year later. Soon afterwards succeeded Cemal Hüsnü Bey as chief Turkish delegate on the Mixed Exchange Commission, where he was a great improvement on his predecessor. Is a hard worker, and a tower of strength to the Foreign Ministry, with which he is always in close contact. In April 1931 was appointed Minister at Sofia, where, according to the Turkish press, he has been active in prosecuting local Turkish journalists for anti-Kemalist publications.

Tevfik Kâmil Bey is without doubt very capable. He is, however, shy and reserved, but when better known is pleasant in conversation and ready freely to express his views on questions which interest him. He is married.

Tevfik Rüştü Bey.

Born about 1885. Doctor in the sanitary service. In 1909 was secretary-general of the Committee of Union and Progress Congress then held. Served as a doctor during the Balkan War, and was made prisoner by the Serbs. In 1920 was a member of a mission to Russia, and later, during the Nationalist movement, was the director of an Angora newspaper. Elected Deputy for Smyrna in July 1923, was secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission which considered the Lausanne Treaty. Later in the year was appointed president of the Turkish Commission for the Exchange of Populations, and early incurred criticism because of his alleged failure adequately to protect Turkish interests. Resigned in September 1924 over the "établis" issue, but subsequently withdrew his resignation and resumed negotiations for the conclusion of a Turco-Greek agreement. In March 1925 became Minister for Foreign Affairs. Proceeded to Europe on various missions, particularly in connexion with the Mosul question, and signed the Angora Treaty in June 1926. During the summer of 1926 his position was weakened owing to his relationship (brother-in-law) with the late Dr. Nazim, whose death sentence he endeavoured to have commuted, but this effect was apparently only temporary, and he again seemed fairly established when he met M. Chicherin at Odessa in November. During the following months rumours of his impending resignation were current, but these proved unfounded, and he retained his portfolio when Ismet Pasha reconstructed his Cabinet in November 1927. In March 1928 attended the Preparatory Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and during the year his position seemed to become steadily stronger. In September 1930 paid an official visit to Moscow. In November headed the Turkish delegation to the Preparatory Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and in December visited Signor Mussolini at Rome and was received by the King. Was the moving spirit on the Turkish side in the Græco-Turkish rapprochement which led to M. Veniselos's visit to Angora in October 1930, when the treaties were signed, and his own and the Prime Minister's return visit to Athens in October 1931.

Tevfik Rüstü Bey is dishevelled in appearance and veils his features behind monumental dark glasses. He is so volatile and voluble that he appears inane. His real influence on Turkish foreign policy is difficult to determine, though his subservience to Ismet Pasha in public lends colour to the theory that he is content for the most part to take his orders from his superiors.

Vasif Bey.

Born about 1885. In 1923 became Deputy for Saruhan and Public Prosecutor of Independence Tribunal sent to Constantinople. In March 1924

became Minister of Public Instruction, resigning in November. June 1925, Minister at Prague, and, November 1927, at Budapest. In November 1928 became Ambassador in Moscow, but in January 1929 was elected Deputy for Smyrna and resigned his post. In February became Minister of Public Instruction for the second time, but resigned in April. Represented Turkey at the International Parliamentary Conference at Berlin in August. Is a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission and one of the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly.

Vasif Bey is tall and heavy in appearance. Is loud and genial and something of a bully on occasion. Has shown conspicuous friendliness to His Majesty's Embassy, and is reputed to be the leader of the Anglophil camp. One of the Gazi's boon companions.

Yunus Nadi Bey.

Born 1878. Educated in Rhodes. Became a protégé of Abdin Pasha Dino, who put him in charge of his farms, but dismissed him after two years because of abuses. Emerged from obscurity in 1908 and became one of the Committee of Union and Progress members for Smyrna in the Chamber of Deputies. In 1911 became editor of the Committee of Union and Progress "Tasviri Efkâr," and in 1916 started the "Yeni Gün." In 1908 received £T. 30,000 from secret Committee of Union and Progress funds. Was imprisoned soon after the armistice, but was soon released, and published attacks on the Allies in his newspaper. On occupation of Constantinople in March 1920 he escaped to Angora, having for some time previously been in touch with Mustafa Kemal. Began publishing his paper there, and became Deputy for Smyrna. In February 1921 was a member of the Angora peace delegation to Rome, Paris and London. In the autumn he fell foul of Mustafa Kemal because of his sympathy with Enver, but in 1922 was received back into the fold and for some time was president of the Foreign Affairs Commission. Throughout this period he wrote many Russophil articles, and was a bitter Anglophobe. Has been Deputy for Mentese since 1923. In 1924 started the "Cümhuriyet" in Constantinople, and soon after the "Yeni Gün" ceased publication. Since 1923 has been president of the Constitution Commission of the Assembly, and, 1926–27, was also a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission. In 1927–28 took the leading part in an enquiry into the peculations of the former Ministers of Marine and Commerce—a curious selection. Spent the summer of 1928 in Russia and Germany, and on his return markedly displayed his Russophil sentiments. In November became member of Executive Bureau of Popular party. In 1929 again visited Germany several times. During the summer of 1931 engaged in the scurrilous press controversy with journalists of the Opposition which led to the stringent press law of the 24th July, directed against the latter. Accompanied Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüstü Bey on their official visit to Athens in October.

Yunus Nadi Bey is short and stout and wears pince-nez. He is intelligent and Turkey's best leader-writer, but is ready to tack to any wind; is an excessive drinker and an unscrupulous scoundrel, whose general behaviour disgusts even the Turks.

Yusuf Bey, Akçura (Oğlu).

Born about 1870 at Simbirsk in the Kazan Tartar region. Emigrated as a child to Turkey, where he received his early education. While still a youth was banished to Tripoli, whence he made his escape with Ferit Bey (now Turkish Ambassador in London) to Tunis and France. Studied in Paris, and on returning to Turkey worked as a journalist and was in close touch with Enver. Was a sedentary worker during the Turkish War of Independence. Elected Deputy for Constantinople in 1923 and again in 1927, when he also became member of the Constitutional Commission of the Assembly. Was about that time a leading member of a group of *intelligentsia*, which it was thought might crystallise into an opposition. Though he did not join Fethi Bey's Liberal party in 1930, there are indications that his critical attitude towards Government policy persisted unchanged. Elected member of the Economic Commission of the Assembly in November 1930. He was closely connected with the development of the Turkish Ojak movement, and is a leading authority on pan-

Turanianism and the Turkish communities outside Turkey. Re-elected Deputy for Constantinople in April 1931.

Yusuf Bey has at least once visited London, and is married to a sister of the present Turkish Ambassadress there (see under "Ferit Bey" above). Is a man of considerable culture and some distinction of personality.

Yusuf Kemal Bey.

Born in 1878 at Sinop. Entered the military school, but transferred in 1901 to the school of law, from which he graduated in 1905. Practised in Constantinople and was for a short time Deputy for Kastamoni, but in 1909 joined the Opposition. In 1910 resigned his seat and spent the following two years in Paris studying law. Throughout the war practised as a barrister in Constantinople. October to December 1919 was Under-Secretary for Justice, and on being sent on a mission of reconciliation to Anatolia, was won over to the Nationalist cause and did not return to Constantinople. Became Minister of Economics early in 1920. In 1920–21 proceeded on mission to Moscow and Tiflis and attended the Baku Congress. Became Minister for Foreign Affairs in May 1921, and throughout his tenure of office was in close touch with Moscow. Proceeded to Paris and London as head of the Angora Peace Delegation in March 1922. Resigned in October, nominally on grounds of ill-health. In July 1923 was elected Deputy for Sinop, and in the following month was president of the Foreign Affairs Commission, which examined the Lausanne Treaty. In January 1924 became Turkish Ambassador in London, but resigned in May on opting for his deputyship. In November was a rival candidate to Kâzim Pasha for the presidency of the Assembly, but was defeated, and for a time took no prominent part in political life, being understood to be out of sympathy with the President of the Republic. From 1925–27 he was, however, reporter of the Justice Commission of the Assembly, and in 1927 accompanied the Minister of Justice to The Hague in connexion with the "Lotus" affair. He was re-elected Deputy in September and is now a member of the Economic Commission of the Assembly. In September 1930 became Minister of Justice in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, and again in May 1931.

Yusuf Kemal Bey is a good speaker and nourishes Bolshevik sympathies, but only in so far as these do not clash with his ideals of Turkish nationalism.

Zekâi (Salih) Bey.

Born in Bosnia in 1878. A graduate of the Mülkiye School and became kaymakam and mütessarif. Was Deputy for Adana in the first Angora Assembly, and in 1921 was a member of Bekir Sami Bey's peace delegation to London. In the following year Turkish economic expert at the Lausanne Conference. Was a member of the Independence Tribunal.

Elected Deputy for Aydin in July 1923, he became Minister for Agriculture in March 1924. In September was appointed Ambassador to London, but was recalled early in 1925 owing to his having, on his own account, proposed a direct deal over Mosul, which he was instructed by Angora to withdraw. In May was appointed Ambassador at Moscow, and in November 1926 was present at Odessa at the interview between M. Chicherin and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs. Resigned in September 1927 on his election—possibly not of his own volition—as Deputy for Diyarbekir. A member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In 1929, when all Powers were obliged by the denunciation of the Commercial Treaty of Lausanne to negotiate fresh treaties, was appointed chief of the delegation for the negotiation of commercial treaties. Appointed Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, September 1930, and Minister of National Defence in December 1930 and again in May 1931.

Zekâi Bey carries, under a mop of grey hair, a perpetual expression of puzzled benignity. He is an industrious worker and a good chief, but of so narrow an outlook as to drive his subordinates to the verge of despair. He has been reported as being anti-British in sympathy in the past, and when in London alienated Turkish sympathisers by his lack of courtesy towards them. During the negotiation of the Anglo-Turkish commercial treaty he was, though slow in the uptake, friendly and helpful in finding the way of compromise. Is no conversationalist.

Zeki Mesut Bey.

Born at Aydin in 1889. Graduated from the Constantinople Mülkiye (Civil) College in 1910. Was employed in various financial capacities and twice went to Europe as a student inspector. In 1926 became member of the Council of Education, and in 1927 director of the Mülkiye College. In September of that year was elected Deputy for Adrianople, and in November secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, of which commission he is still a member. In 1929 took an increasingly prominent part in the discussion of foreign affairs, on which subject he contributed numerous articles to the semi-official press. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan Congress at Athens in October 1930. Elected Deputy for Adrianople in April 1931.

Zeki Mesut Bey wears behind his glasses the strained expression of a short-sighted man who refuses to wear any. He is friendly, but not unduly communicative. He speaks good French.

[E 441/155/93] No. 14.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 29.)

(No. 27. Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora, January* 18, 1932.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 1, Saving, of the 11th instant, regarding the signature of certain treaties between Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of the text of the Turco-Iraqi Commercial Treaty signed at Angora on the 10th January, 1932.

2. The treaty provides that each country shall in general grant the other most-favoured-nation treatment, except in regard to advantages accorded by either country to produce of other territories detached in 1923 from the Ottoman Empire, and in regard to border trade conducted within a zone 15 kilom. wide on each side of the Turco-Iraqi frontier. It also stipulates that negotiations are to be opened between Turkey and Iraq with a view to the application of a special tariff on imports from one country into the other.

3. On the signature of the treaty, letters, of which the text has not been supplied to me, were exchanged providing for a reduction by one-third of Turkish customs duty on imported Iraqi dates, and a corresponding one-third reduction of Iraqi customs duty on imported Turkish gall-nuts and firewood. The Turkish authorities agreed also to fix the value of the quota for Iraqi dates during the next season at £T. 100,000. According to officials of the Iraqi Legation, the loss to Iraqi revenue by the reduction of dues on imported Turkish gall-nuts and firewood will be about 3,500 rupees a year. Agreement was also reached outside the treaty as to the opening of certain transit and other trade routes for customs purposes.

4. The mutual concessions stipulated in the treaty cannot be claimed by other nations, for it has been usual for Turkey to obtain in commercial treaties with other Powers the insertion (*e.g.* in article 34 of the Anglo-Turkish Treaty of the 1st March, 1930) of clauses exempting from the application of most-favoured-nation treatment any special advantages accorded between Turkey and any country detached from the Ottoman Empire under the Lausanne Treaty of the 24th July, 1923.

5. The Iraqi Chargé d'Affaires, who kindly communicated to me the attached text of the treaty, begs that it may be regarded as confidential until it enters into force.

6. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 14.

Traité de Commerce entre le Royaume de l'Irak et la République turque.

SA Majesté le Roi d'Irak, d'une part, et le Président de la République turque, d'autre part, désireux de conserver et de développer leurs relations commerciales et de déterminer le traitement à accorder dans leurs territoires respectifs au commerce de l'autre partie, ont décidé de conclure un Traité de Commerce et ont nommé à cet effet pour leurs plénipotentiaires respectifs :

Sa Majesté le Roi d'Irak :

Son Excellence le Général Nuri Essaid Pacha, Président du Conseil des Ministres d'Irak, deuxième Classe de l'Ordre de Rafidein ;

Le Président de la République turque :

Son Excellence Mustafa Seref Bey, Ministre de l'Economie nationale, Député de Burdur ;

Lesquels, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes :

ARTICLE 1er.

En ce qui concerne les droits d'importation et d'exportation, y compris les surtaxes et coefficients de majoration, et tous autres droits et charges ayant trait au commerce et à la douane, ainsi qu'en matière de transit, d'entreposage, des formalités douanières et du régime des échantillons de commis voyageurs, l'Irak accordera à la Turquie et la Turquie accordera à l'Irak le traitement de la nation la plus favorisée.

Il ne sera donc prélevé sur l'importation ou l'écoulement en Irak de n'importe quels produits naturels ou industriels de la Turquie des droits plus élevés ou autres que ceux qui sont ou seront perçus sur des produits naturels ou industriels de n'importe quel autre pays étranger.

De même, il ne sera pas prélevé sur l'importation ou l'écoulement en Turquie de n'importe quels produits naturels ou industriels de l'Irak des droits plus élevés ou autres que ceux qui sont ou seront perçus sur des produits naturels ou industriels de n'importe quel autre pays étranger.

Egalement, il ne sera pas perçu en Irak ou en Turquie sur l'exportation de n'importe quels articles destinés à l'autre partie des droits plus élevés ou autres que ceux prélevés sur l'exportation des articles similaires à destination de n'importe quel autre pays étranger.

Tout avantage, quel qu'il soit, que l'une des deux hautes parties contractantes pourra accorder à un article quelconque, produit naturel ou industriel de tout autre pays étranger, s'appliquera simultanément et sans que la demande en soit formulée, au même article, produit naturel ou fabriqué, de l'autre haute partie contractante.

Les stipulations de cet article ne s'étendent pas :

(*a*) Aux avantages et faveurs spéciales que l'Irak et la Turquie accordent ou qu'ils accorderaient à l'avenir en matière de tarif douanier à des produits provenant d'autres pays détachés de l'ancien Empire ottoman en 1923 ;

(*b*) Au traitement que l'Irak ou la Turquie accorderait au commerce frontalier dans une zone ne dépassant pas 15 kilom. en largeur de chaque côté de leur frontière douanière.

ARTICLE 2.

Les deux hautes parties contractantes s'engagent réciproquement à appliquer le traitement de la nation la plus favorisée en ce qui concerne les prohibitions et les restrictions sur les importations et les exportations.

Toutefois, les deux parties, sans être tenues d'accorder le traitement de la nation la plus favorisée se réservent la liberté d'imposer des prohibitions ou des restrictions d'un caractère sanitaire destinées à protéger la vie humaine, animale ou végétale.

ARTICLE 3.

Chacune des hautes parties contractantes s'engagent à entamer, dans le plus bref délai possible, des negociations en vue d'arriver à un accord destiné à assurer l'application d'un tarif spécial à l'importation des produits naturels ou industriels de l'autre partie.

ARTICLE 4.

Le présent traité, rédigé en langues arabe, turque et française, sera ratifié et les instruments de ratification seront échangés à Bagdad, aussitôt que faire se pourra.

Il entrera en vigueur quinze jours après la date de l'échange des instruments de ratification et restera en vigueur jusqu'à ce qu'il soit dénoncé, cette dénonciation ne pouvant produire ses effets qu'après l'expiration d'un délai de trois mois à partir de la date à laquelle elle aurait été notifiée par l'une des hautes parties contractantes.

S'il s'élève un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application du présent traité, le texte français fera foi.

En foi de quoi les plénipotentiaires ont signé le présent traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait à Ankara, le 10 janvier 1932.

NURI ESSAID.
MUSTAFA ŞEREF.

[T 1193/146/374] No. 15.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 28.)

(No. 28. Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora, January* 18, 1932.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 1, Saving, of the 11th instant, regarding the signature of certain treaties between Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of the text of the Turco-Iraqi Extradition Treaty signed at Angora on the 9th January, 1932. The Iraqi Legation, to whom I owe the text of the treaty, beg that it may be regarded as confidential until it enters into force.

2. It will be seen that article 1 of the treaty provides that the extradition of persons who are neither Turkish nor Iraqi nationals is subject to the discretion of the State from which extradition is demanded. Article 4, too, is of interest in that it excludes from the class of political offences crimes against the person of the head of the State or against those of members of his family, and also the assassination or attempted assassination of the head of the Government. In article 16 it will be observed that each party assumes liability for expenses incurred on its own territory as a result of extradition proceedings.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 15.

Traité d'Extradition entre le Royaume d'Irak et la République turque.

SA Majesté le Roi d'Irak, d'une part, et le Président de la République turque, d'autre part, désirant conclure un traité à l'effet de régler l'extradition des délinquants, ont nommé pour leurs plénipotentiaires respectifs :

Sa Majesté le Roi d'Irak :

Son Excellence le Général Nuri Essaïd Pacha, Président du Conseil des Ministres d'Irak, II^me^ Classe de l'Ordre de Rafideïn,

et

Le Président de la République turque :

Son Excellence Mustafa Seref Beyfendi, Ministre de l'Économie nationale, Député de Burdur ;

Lesquels, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes :

ARTICLE 1^er^.

Les hautes parties contractantes s'engagent, conformément aux dispositions du présent traité, à se livrer réciproquement les individus poursuivis ou condamnés par les autorités judiciaires de l'une d'elles, et qui se trouvent sur le territoire de l'autre.

Il reste bien entendu que les nationaux des hautes parties contractantes sont exceptés de l'extradition, et l'extradition des ressortissants étrangers est sujette à la discrétion de l'État auquel elle est demandée.

L'extradition n'aura lieu qu'en cas de poursuite ou de condamnation pour une infraction commise hors du territoire de l'État auquel l'extradition est demandée.

ARTICLE 2.

En cas de demande concernant une personne qui est l'objet de poursuites, ou contre laquelle un jugement a été prononcé, l'extradition ne sera accordée que si l'acte dont cette personne est incriminée est puni, d'après la législation des deux pays, d'une peine d'au moins un an d'emprisonnement ou d'une peine plus grave.

Lorsque l'extradition est demandée en vue de l'exécution d'un jugement devenu définitif, elle ne sera accordée que si le délinquant a été condamné définitivement à une peine supérieure à six mois d'emprisonnement, pour un fait punissable, d'après la législation des deux pays, d'une peine d'au moins un an d'emprisonnement, ou d'une peine plus grave.

ARTICLE 3.

L'extradition sera accordée également en cas de tentative ou de participation, sous n'importe quelle forme, et de n'importe quelle nature, au cas où la tentative ou la participation seraient, conformément aux dispositions de l'article 2, passibles de peines dans les législations de l'État requérant et de l'État requis.

ARTICLE 4.

L'extradition ne sera pas accordée dans les cas suivants :

(*a*) Pour les infractions politiques et les faits connexes;
(*b*) Pour les infractions militaires et les faits connexes;
(*c*) Pour les infractions de presse;
(*d*) Pour les infractions qui ne peuvent être poursuivies que sur la plainte de la personne lésée et dont la poursuite doit être arrêtée par le désistement de celle-ci;
(*e*) Si l'individu réclamé est poursuivi par l'État requérant pour une infraction prescrite ou éteinte d'après ses lois, celles de l'État requis ou celles de l'État sur le territoire duquel l'infraction a été commise;

(*f*) Si l'individu réclamé est poursuivi pour le même fait dans le pays requis, ainsi que s'il y a déjà été définitivement mis hors de cause, condamné, déclaré irresponsable ou acquitté également pour le même fait;
(*g*) Si les autorités de l'État requis sont, d'après les lois de celui-ci, compétentes pour juger l'infraction;
(*h*) Si, le fait étant commis sur le territoire d'un État tiers, les lois de la partie requise n'admettent pas la poursuite pour un tel fait commis à l'étranger.

Cependant, ne seront pas considérés comme une infraction politique ni comme fait connexe à une semblable infraction :

(1) Tout délit commis contre la personne du chef d'État et contre celles des membres de sa famille;
(2) L'assassinat commis sur la personne du chef de Gouvernement ou tentative d'assassinat ou complicité à ce fait;
(3) Les actes de brigandage, de torture et de vol accompagné de torture, quel que soit le but pour lequel ces actes ont été commis.

ARTICLE 5.

La demande d'extradition devra toujours être faite par la voie diplomatique.

ARTICLE 6.

Dans les cas qui ne comportent pas l'extradition du délinquant et qui sont prévus et énumérés dans l'article 4, l'appréciation de la nature des actes est exclusivement réservée à l'État auquel l'extradition est demandée.

Les parties contractantes sont d'accord pour reconnaître que, quelle que soit la procédure à suivre pour l'examen de la demande d'extradition, le refus d'extradition pour une infraction politique ne pourra être prononcé que par le tribunal compétent désigné par l'État requis.

ARTICLE 7.

1. La demande d'extradition pour un prévenu ou un accusé doit être accompagnée des documents suivants :

(*a*) Un mandat d'arrêt ou un acte d'arrestation émanant d'une autorité judiciaire compétente;
(*b*) Un acte indiquant la nature du délit et le texte de la loi applicable à l'infraction dont il s'agit;
(*c*) Une déclaration ou une carte d'identité aussi détaillée que possible, indiquant l'identité et le signalement du prévenu ou de l'accusé;
(*d*) Les actes de déposition, s'il y en a, certifiés conformes par le juge qui a procédé à l'enquête.

2. Si la demande d'extradition concerne une personne qui a été l'objet d'un jugement par défaut, faute de comparaître ou faute de défendre, la demande d'extradition sera accompagnée, en sus des pièces indiquées dans le paragraphe précédent, d'un résumé du jugement et du texte des articles de la loi sur lesquels ce jugement se base.

3. Si la demande d'extradition concerne une personne condamnée par jugement contradictoire, les pièces suivantes doivent être annexées à la demande :

(*a*) Une expédition du jugement;
(*b*) Une déclaration ou une carte d'identité indiquant d'une façon suffisamment détaillée l'identité de la personne condamnée;
(*c*) Une copie du texte de la loi sur laquelle le jugement se base;
(*d*) Un document émanant d'une autorité compétente et déclarant le jugement exécutoire.

4. Lorsqu'il s'agit d'infractions contre la propriété, le montant approximatif du dommage réel ou tenté sera toujours indiqué.

5. Les pièces à produire seront dressées dans la forme prescrite par les lois de l'État requérant et expédiées en original ou en copie certifiée conforme par le

tribunal ou par toute autre autorité compétente de cet État; elles seront accompagnées d'une traduction dans la langue de l'État requis, certifiée conforme par l'agent diplomatique de l'État requérant ou par un traducteur assermenté de l'État requis.

6. Il est entendu que, tout en se réservant la décision sur la demande d'extradition, les autorités compétentes de l'État requis préviendront, aussitôt que celui-ci aura reçu les pièces désignées ci-dessus, par l'arrestation de l'accusé ou par toute autre mesure opportune, l'éventualité d'une évasion, à moins que l'extradition ne paraisse *a priori* inadmissible.

7. Dans le cas où il y aurait doute sur la question de savoir si l'infraction, objet de la demande d'extradition, est comprise parmi les infractions prévues dans le présent traité comme comportant l'extradition, des explications seront demandées au Gouvernement requérant, et l'extradition ne sera pas accordée tant que les explications fournies ne seront pas de nature à écarter ce doute. L'individu arrêté pourra être élargi, ou les mesures prises à son égard pourront être rapportées, si les explications n'ont pas été données à l'État requis dans le délai de deux mois à partir du jour où la demande en a été transmise au représentant diplomatique de l'État requérant.

ARTICLE 8.

La haute partie contractante à laquelle l'extradition est demandée ordonnera l'arrestation du délinquant et fera procéder à l'examen nécessaire de l'affaire, si elle se trouve convaincue que l'infraction comporte l'extradition aux termes du présent traité. Elle ordonnera l'extradition si, à l'issue de l'examen, elle acquiert la conviction que le dossier est complet ou suffisant, que la personne dont l'extradition est demandée est bien celle qui a été désignée comme prévenue, accusée ou condamnée, et, en cas de condamnation, que l'infraction qui l'a motivée est de celles qui comportaient l'extradition au moment où le jugement a été rendu.

ARTICLE 9

Dans le cas où, en attendant la présentation à la partie requise de la demande d'extradition du délinquant et des pièces mentionnées dans le présent traité comme devant accompagner cette demande, l'évasion du délinquant apparaît comme probable, l'État auquel l'extradition est demandée, sans attendre l'arrivée des pièces requises, et sur avis de l'État requérant à adresser par voie postale ou télégraphique au Ministère des Affaires étrangères de l'État requis, ou sur la démarche à faire par le représentant diplomatique de l'État requérant, préviendra l'évasion en procédant à l'arrestation provisoire du délinquant ou à l'adoption de toute autre mesure.

Toutefois, dans ce cas, avis devra être donné concernant le genre et la nature du délit, le degré de gravité de la peine, et notification devra être faite qu'un mandat d'arrêt a été lancé contre le délinquant par l'autorité compétente.

Si la demande d'extradition et les documents s'y rapportant concernant la personne ainsi arrêtée provisoirement, ou à l'endroit de laquelle toute autre mesure a été adoptée, n'ont pas été transmis à l'État requis dans le délai d'un mois à partir du jour de l'arrestation ou de l'adoption de toute autre mesure, la personne arrêtée sera libérée ou la mesure adoptée à son égard sera rapportée.

ARTICLE 10.

Les objets dans la possession desquels la personne réclamée est entrée par suite de l'infraction, ou ceux qui ont été saisis sur elle, les instruments ayant servi à commettre l'infraction, ainsi que toute autre pièce à conviction, seront, sous réserve des droits des tiers, et suivant l'application de l'autorité compétente, remis, en même temps que la personne réclamée, au Gouvernement réclamant l'extradition, et cela même dans le cas où l'extradition déjà accordée n'a pu être effectuée par suite du décès ou de l'évasion du coupable.

Cette remise comprendra également tous les objets de même nature, cachés ou déposés par la personne réclamée dans le pays accordant l'extradition, et qui seraient découverts ultérieurement.

ARTICLE 11.

Si l'individu réclamé est poursuivi ou condamné sur le territoire de l'État requis pour une infraction autre que celle qui a motivé la demande d'extradition, son extradition pourra être différée jusqu'à ce que les poursuites aient pris fin ou que l'individu réclamé ait subi sa peine ou enfin qu'il en ait obtenu la remise.

De même, dans le cas de procédure en cours devant les autorités de la partie requise pour un motif autre que l'infraction aux lois pénales et entraînant la comparution forcée ou la détention de l'individu réclamé, l'extradition pourra être différée jusqu'à ce que les poursuites ou la détention aient pris fin.

Néanmoins, si d'après les lois du pays qui demande l'extradition, cet ajournement est susceptible d'entraîner la prescription ou d'autres difficultés importantes en ce qui concerne la poursuite de l'inculpé, sa remise temporaire sera accordée, à moins de considérations spéciales qui s'y opposent, sous l'engagement de renvoyer l'extradé aussitôt que les poursuites dans le pays requérant auront pris fin.

Dans le cas où l'individu réclamé serait impuissant, par suite de l'extradition, à remplir les obligations contractées par lui envers des particuliers, son extradition aura quand même lieu, sauf à ces derniers à faire valoir leurs droits par-devant l'autorité compétente.

ARTICLE 12.

Si l'extradition est accordée, l'individu réclamé sera mis à la disposition de l'État requérant à la station-frontière ou au port d'embarquement de l'État requis.

Ledit individu pourra être mis en liberté si, dans le délai d'un mois à partir de la notification de la décision d'extradition, l'État requérant n'en a pas pris livraison.

ARTICLE 13.

La personne livrée ne peut être jugée que pour le délit ou les délits qui ont motivé sa livraison. L'extradé peut, cependant, être arrêté et jugé pour un délit autre que celui ou ceux qui ont motivé sa livraison, dans le cas où le consentement de l'État requis y est acquis, ou encore dans celui où cet individu, ayant eu la possibilité de rentrer dans le pays qui l'avait livré, n'a pas profité de cette possibilité.

L'extradition, à un État tiers, d'un individu livré ne pourra également avoir lieu que dans les conditions ci-haut indiquées. Toutefois, si l'individu livré consent à être jugé, le consentement de l'État qui l'a livré n'est plus nécessaire; il lui en est seulement donné avis.

Les dispositions du présent article ne s'appliquent pas aux infractions commises, après la livraison, sur le territoire de l'État qui a demandé l'extradition.

ARTICLE 14.

Si l'individu dont l'extradition est demandée par une des parties contractantes est réclamé également par un ou plusieurs autres États, en raison d'autres infractions, il sera livré à l'État sur le territoire duquel a été commise l'infraction la plus grave, et, dans le cas où les infractions seraient de gravité égale, à l'État dont il est ressortissant.

Lorsque l'individu réclamé ne ressortit à aucun des États requérants, et que les infractions sont de gravité égale, il sera livré à l'État dont la demande est arrivée la première. La gravité de l'infraction sera déterminée d'après les lois de l'État requis.

ARTICLE 15.

Si l'extradition d'un délinquant a lieu entre l'une des parties contractantes et une tierce Puissance, et à condition que l'infraction motivant l'extradition ne soit pas comprise parmi les faits prévus dans l'article 4, l'autre partie autorisera le passage en transit à travers son territoire de cet individu et des objets prévus à l'article 10, à moins que l'individu dont il s'agit ne soit un de ses nationaux.

La demande de transit devra être faite par voie diplomatique, avec production en original ou en copie dûment certifiée conforme des actes mentionnés dans l'article 7.

ARTICLE 16.

Les parties contractantes renoncent réciproquement à toute réclamation ayant pour objet le remboursement des frais occasionnés sur leur territoire respectif, par l'arrestation, l'entretien et le transport du délinquant, et par la remise temporaire mentionnée à l'article 11.

Les frais de transit, sur le territoire de l'une des parties contractantes, d'un individu extradé ou remis temporairement à l'autre partie par une tierce Puissance, seront à la charge de l'État requérant.

ARTICLE 17.

Les dispositions en général, et plus particulièrement celles de l'article 9 du Traité de Bon-Voisinage signé entre l'Irak, la Grande-Bretagne et la Turquie à Ankara le 5 juin 1926, et qui ont des rapports plus ou moins étroits avec l'objet du présent traité, continueront d'être en vigueur.

ARTICLE 18.

Le présent traité sera ratifié par les deux hautes parties contractantes et les ratifications seront échangées à Bagdad dans le plus bref délai possible.

Le traité entrera en vigueur quinze jours après l'échange des ratifications, il sera exécutoire pendant un an, et ne cessera de produire effet que six mois après la date à laquelle l'une des hautes parties contractantes exprimera à l'autre son désir de le dénoncer.

En cas de divergence entre les textes de ce traité, rédigé en arabe, en turc et en français, c'est le texte français qui fera foi.

En foi de quoi les plénipotentiaires respectifs ont signé le présent traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait à Ankara, le 9 janvier 1932.

NURI ESSAID.
MUSTAFA SEREF.

[E 442/35/93] No. 16.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 29.)

(No. 29. Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora, January* 18, 1932.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 1, Saving, of the 11th instant, regarding the signature of certain treaties between Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of the text of the Turco-Iraqi Residence Convention, signed at Angora on the 9th January, 1932.

2. Points of interest in the convention are (1) that most-favoured-nation treatment is without prejudice to the immigration laws of each country, (2) that Turkey can share only on condition of reciprocity in special passport and visa favours accorded by Iraq to neighbouring Arab countries, and (3) that Turks in Iraq are accorded most-favoured-nation treatment in judicial matters.

3. In communicating this convention to me, the Iraqi Legation begged that the text may be regarded as confidential until it enters into force.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 16.

Convention d'Établissement entre l'Irak et la Turquie.

SA Majesté le Roi d'Irak, d'une part, et le Président de la République turque, d'autre part, également animés du désir de resserrer les liens d'amitié si heureusement existant entre les deux pays et de fixer les conditions dans lesquelles les ressortissants et les sociétés de chacune des deux hautes parties contractantes pourraient s'établir et exercer le commerce dans le territoire de l'autre partie ainsi que de régler les questions ayant trait à la compétence judiciaire et aux charges fiscales, ont décidé de conclure à cet effet une Convention d'Établissement et ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires respectifs :

Sa Majesté le Roi d'Irak :

Son Excellence le Général Nuri Essaid Pacha, Président du Conseil des Ministres de l'Irak, deuxième Classe de l'Ordre de Rafideïn ;

Le Président de la République turque :

Son Excellence Mustafa Şeref Beyfendi, Ministre de l'Économie nationale, Député de Burdur ;

Lesquels, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes :

ARTICLE 1er.

En ce qui concerne les conditions d'établissement et de séjour qui seront applicables aux ressortissants et sociétés de chacun des deux pays sur le territoire de l'autre, ainsi qu'en matière des charges fiscales et des questions judiciaires, y compris celle de la compétence, l'Irak accordera à la Turquie et la Turquie accordera à l'Irak le même traitement que celui qui est accordé ou pourrait être accordé au pays tiers le plus favorisé.

Aucune disposition de cette convention ne saurait être interprétée comme ayant une influence quelconque sur les lois et les règlements existants dans chacun des deux pays concernant l'immigration des étrangers ou sur le droit de chacun des deux pays d'édicter des lois et règlements de cette nature.

Quant aux avantages spéciaux accordés ou qui seront accordés par l'Irak aux pays arabes limitrophes, en ce qui concerne les passeports et les visas, la Turquie ne pourra en demander le bénéfice, en invoquant la clause de la nation la plus favorisée, qu'à condition de réciprocité.

En ce qui concerne le droit de propriété immobilière, les ressortissants de chacune des hautes parties contractantes jouiront sur les territoires de l'autre du traitement de la nation la plus favorisée, sous réserve des dispositions des lois en vigueur dans les deux pays.

L'application de cette disposition est subordonnée à la condition de parfaite réciprocité.

ARTICLE 2.

La présente convention, rédigée en langue arabe, turque et française, sera ratifiée et les instruments de ratification seront échangés à Bagdad aussitôt que faire se pourra.

Elle entrera en vigueur quinze jours après l'échange des instruments de ratification et demeurera obligatoire pendant un an, avec tacite reconduction aussi longtemps qu'elle ne sera pas dénoncée par l'une des hautes parties contractantes.

En cas de dénonciation, elle demeurera encore en vigueur trois mois à partir du jour où l'une des hautes parties contractantes aura notifié à l'autre son intention d'en faire cesser les effets.

S'il s'élève un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application de la présente convention le texte français fera foi.

En foi de quoi, les plénipotentiaires ont signé la présente convention et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait à Ankara le 9 janvier 1932.

NURI ESSAID.
MUSTAFA SEREF.

[E 443/35/93] No. 17.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 29.)

(No. 30. Confidential.)

Angora, January 18, 1932.

Sir,

WITH reference to my telegram No. 1, Saving, of the 11th instant, regarding the signature of certain treaties between Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to report that I have been confidentially informed by Nuri Pasha that the position of certain matters raised during the course of the treaty negotiations is as follows:—

(*a*) The Turkish Government accepted his suggestions for the execution of certain preliminary measures to put a stop to brigandage on the Turco-Iraqi frontier. It postponed the settlement of the question of allowing Iraqi flocks to enter Turkish pastures until Iraq entered the League of Nations. It agreed to instruct its officials to arrest the Sheikh of Barzan if found in Turkey, and to deliver him to the Iraqi Government. It also raised no objection to the settlement of Assyrians in the Baradost area.

(*b*) Letters were exchanged between Nuri Pasha and the Turkish authorities regarding a readaptation or reinterpretation of article 14 of the Anglo-Turco-Iraqi Treaty concluded at Angora on the 5th June, 1926. This article refers to the Turkish share of royalties received by the Iraqi Government from the (then) Turkish Petroleum Company. The letters exchanged provide that His Majesty's Government (in the United Kingdom) are to be consulted in respect of the negotiations which are shortly to take place with a view to amend article 14.

2. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner in Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 447/447/44] No. 18.

Sir George Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 29.)

(No. 35.)

Angora, January 22, 1932.

Sir,

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 432 of the 23rd December last, I have the honour to report that on the 7th instant the Grand National Assembly approved three Government Bills designed to rid the country of the serious abuses caused by the contraband traffic, which is held to be so serious a factor in the present economic crisis in Turkey.

2. According to the semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" of the 8th January, the first of these laws provides for the creation of the post of "General Commandant for Customs Defence," to be attached to the newly-established Ministry of Customs and Monopolies. This functionary is to assume control of all anti-contraband activities within the customs zones, both on land and sea. In matters affecting the surveillance of the land and maritime frontiers he is to take orders from the Chief of the General Staff, and, in matters connected with internal surveillance, from the Minister of the Interior. He will also be subordinated to the Chief of the General Staff as regards the training and exercising of the troops under his command, and to the Ministry of National Defence in such other purely military matters as personnel and equipment. His jurisdiction may, by a decree of the Council of Ministers, be extended to districts outside the established customs zones.

3. The second law provides for the setting up of sixteen special courts to deal with contraband offences, and allots an additional credit of £T. 230,000 in this year's budget of the Ministry of Justice in order to provide salaries for the necessary sixteen judges, the same number each of public prosecutors and *juges d'instruction*, and numerous lesser functionaries from chief clerks to door-keepers, of which latter no court may possess more than two.

4. The third law confers on a "Commission of Order" power to dismiss, subject to the approval of the Minister of Customs and Monopolies, customs officials discovered to have been guilty of abuses in the execution of their duties, while the Minister himself is empowered to dismiss officials "of whose professional services no further use can be made."

5. The choice of the Government for the post of "General Commandant for Customs Defence" has fallen upon General Seyfi Pasha, who has been for some time past Under-Secretary for Land Forces in the Ministry of National Defence, and has the reputation of being an extremely serious, hard-working and intelligent officer; while the press announces that the sixteen new judges referred to in paragraph 3 have already been selected.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 774/33/34] No. 19.

Mr. Hoare to Sir John Simon.—(*Received February* 16.)

(No. 46.)

Tehran, January 27, 1932.

Sir,

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December last, I have the honour to report that Tevfik Rüstü Bey, Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, accompanied by the Turkish Ambassador and the following staff:—

His Excellency Djelal Bey (Deputy for Smyrna and Director-General of the "Banque d'Affaires"; former Minister),
Hussein Vasfi Bey (Director-General in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs),
Colonel Chükrü Ali Bey (General Staff),
Idris Tchora Bey (secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs; former consul),
Osman Nuri Bey (secretary in the "Banque d'Affaires"),

arrived at Pahlavi on the 17th January and reached the capital on the 18th January by road, the Persian authorities having performed a really remarkable piece of work in clearing of a heavy snow-fall the difficult passes between here and the Caspian. Three days (one of them an eighteen-hour day) of intensive work followed, as Tevfik Rüstü Bey wished to leave for Bagdad on the 25th January, and by the 24th January it was possible to issue a communiqué, of which a copy is enclosed, stating that agreement had been reached on the subject of the frontier in the neighbourhood of Little Ararat, and that it had been decided to conclude a treaty of arbitration and to initiate discussions for the conclusion of establishment, commercial and extradition conventions, as well as for the development of economic relations.

2. From both Tevfik Rüstü Bey (who greeted me as a long-lost twin) and Feroughi I have formed the definite impression that the visit is regarded as a great success, having cleared away an atmosphere of suspicion which was a stubborn relic of the past more than anything else. Tevfik Rüstü Bey declared that the Persians were genuinely surprised at the goodwill and desire for compromise which he had shown, but which had from the time of the Mosul negotiations been the keynote of Turkey's foreign policy; as I knew well, his general line of conduct, which had received the steady support of the Ghazi, was that even an indifferently satisfactory settlement was infinitely preferable to no settlement at all. He hoped and believed that he had taught the Persians a lesson in the art of compromise which would be useful in promoting a settlement of the outstanding issues between Persia and His Majesty's Government. His Excellency further told me that nothing could have been more cordial than the Shah's manner to him. His Majesty clearly had a sound grasp of the main political issues which confronted his country.

3. At one of the parties given in his honour, Tevfik Rüstü told me that he had just received a piece of news which delighted him, as he felt sure it would me, namely, that you hoped to pay a visit to Angora in the course of the month of May. Having shared his delight, I said something—jokingly—about this being a counterblast to the Litvinov visit, which led him to affirm that there was

no danger of any misunderstanding with Moscow; in fact, so far as Turkish policy was concerned, he was perfectly sure that both in London and in Moscow everybody slept soundly in their beds ("dormaient sur les deux oreilles"). I replied that I was sure that they did in London, but was his Excellency absolutely convinced that they did in Moscow? The answer was "yes," but with the qualification that Moscow was perhaps hyper-sensitive and inclined to be suspicious; all was well, however, provided that care was taken to strangle suspicions even before they saw the light of day.

4. Tevfik Rüstü Bey had intended to return by air viâ Bagdad, but weather conditions have been hopeless, and he will now leave for Pahlavi and Moscow on the 29th January. The change of plan has enabled him to meet Teymourtache, who arrived to-day.

5. Since I drafted this despatch I have received from Sir G Clerk a copy of his despatch No. 9, Confidential, of the 6th January. I will therefore add, in view of paragraph 4 of that despatch and as an humble tribute to Tevfik Rüstü's political acumen, that, when I talked to Feroughi yesterday about the results of the visit, he said frankly that the Persian Government had been thoroughly suspicious of Turkey's intentions, but that these suspicions had been dissipated by Tevfik Rüstü's obvious sincerity.

I have, &c.
R. H. HOARE.

Enclosure in No. 19.

Extract from the "Messager de Téhéran" of January 24, 1932.

Communiqué officiel du Ministère des Affaires étrangères.

AU moment où son Excellence le Dr. Tevfik Rustu Bey, Ministre des Affaires étrangerès de Turquie, s'est rendu à Téhéran pour transmettre à Sa Majesté impériale le Schahinschah, l'expression des sentiments fraternels de son Excellence le Ghazi Mustafa Kemal, Président de la République turque, et de rappeler, de la part du Gouvernement et du peuple turcs, au Gouvernement et au peuple persans les amitiés sincères et traditionnelles qui existent entre les deux pays, le distingué Ministre des Affaires étrangères turc, après avoir rendu visite aux personnalités officielles persanes et mené des pourparlers ayant pour effet, conformément au désir des deux nations exprimé par les deux chefs suprêmes des deux pays respectifs, de resserrer davantage les liens d'amitié existant entre les deux pays, est tombé d'accord avec le Gouvernement impérial sur les moyens de résoudre les différends concernant la fixation de la ligne frontière entre la Perse et la Turquie, ainsi que sur le mode de régler les différends pouvant surgir dans l'avenir entre les deux États.

En conséquence, il est conclu entre les Gouvernements persan et turc un accord relatif à la fixation de leurs frontières respectives. Conformément à cet accord, la ligne frontière entre les deux pays est la même que celle convenue il y a trois ans à Ankara entre son Altesse Foroughi et son Excellence Tevfik Rustu Bey. Il est entendu que dans la région montagneuse d'Aghri-Dagh le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté laisse à la Turquie une bande de terrain. En échange, le Gouvernement turc abandonne à la Perse dans la région de Bajergueh une partie de ses territoires. Dans la région de Kotour, où, depuis de longues années, il y avait entre les deux Gouvernements des divergences relatives à la ligne frontière, laquelle était restée confuse, le Gouvernement turc a accepté d'abandonner à la Perse une partie des territoires contestés et ainsi la ligne frontière, ici également, fut fixée. De cette façon, tous différends concernant la frontière sont entièrement réglés entre les deux parties.

Sur la base de ce qui précède, le texte d'un accord fut arrêté et signé par les Ministres des Affaires étrangères des deux Gouvernements. Il a été aussi entendu qu'au printemps prochain une commission mixte, composée des représentants des deux Gouvernements, sera chargée de se rendre sur les lieux et de placer les bornes frontières conformément aux termes de l'accord susmentionné.

Au sujet des différends possibles pouvant surgir dans l'avenir entre les deux pays, son Excellence Tevfik Rustu Bey et son Altesse Foroughi ont signé un traité relatif à l'arbitrage et à la conciliation d'après les modèles actuellement en cours dans le domaine international.

L'accord et le traité susmentionnés conclus en français seront remis aux Parlements respectifs des deux pays après avoir été traduits en persan et en turc.

En dehors de ces deux documents déjà signés, son Excellence le Dr. Tevfik Rustu Bey et sa suite ont engagé avec des personnalités persanes des pourparlers relatifs aux questions économiques, voies et communications ainsi qu'aux Conventions d'Établissement, de Commerce et d'Extradition. Les deux parties ont fait preuve d'ardents désirs pour arriver à des résultats certains et il fut entendu que leurs pourparlers et les études nécessaires à ces différents sujets seront terminés le plus rapidement possible.

[E 702/702/44] No. 20.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received February* 11.)

(No. 53.)

Sir, *Angora, February* 5, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that during the religious month of Ramazan now drawing to a close, passages from the Koran have, for the first time in history, been read in Turkish in several mosques, both in Constantinople and in Angora, and have apparently been listened to with much interest by large numbers of the faithful.

2. This innovation, which cannot be conceived as of other than official inspiration, and seems to mark the beginning of a new official attitude towards the Moslem religion in this country, has been commented on with marked approval in the press, and has moved Yunus Nadi Bey of the "Cümhuriyet" and "République" to write a leading article deploring the former obscurantism of the Turkish Moslem clergy, who frowned on any translation of the Koran into the vernacular, with the result that all Turks who had not wasted the best years of their life in acquiring a knowledge of Arabic were unable to understand and benefit by the sacred volume which they were taught blindly and ignorantly to revere.

3. Signs had not been wanting of something like a revival of religion in Turkey for some time previous to the occurrence of the phenomenon just recorded, and it is noteworthy that the proposal to make Sunday the weekly day of rest instead of Friday was mooted again some months ago, only to relapse hurriedly into apparent oblivion, although the measure is known to commend itself in the highest quarters. It would seem that the Government, realising the hold religious traditions still retain over the mass of the people, has decided, instead of alienating it still further, to attract it towards the new régime by a policy of apparent benevolence in spiritual matters, and, by cutting it adrift from all extraneous religious associations, to inculcate side by side the spirit of Turkish nationalism and a modernistic outlook on religion which may be calculated to produce the desired result more effectively than any measures of open repression.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 866/70/44] No. 21.

Department of Overseas Trade to Foreign Office.—(*Received February* 20.)

THE Comptroller-General of the Department of Overseas Trade presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and transmits herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora respecting the financial situation in Turkey.

Department of Overseas Trade,
February 18, 1932.

Enclosure in No. 21.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.

(No. O.T. (A) 4. Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora, February* 3, 1932.

SINCE I have been in Turkey I have held the opinion, and expressed it in despatches and semi-official letters, that, however slow and unwilling the present Turkish Government may be to pay the foreign debts of the Imperial régime, it can be counted on to settle its own debts, and that foreign firms can safely contract with it to supply material. I still believe this to be the case, but an incident has recently come to my notice which, without changing my opinion, seems to run counter to it, and illustrates the narrow margin of safety within which the Government works and throws a light on the financial difficulties which at present beset it. The facts are as follows:—

2. More than a year ago Abdulhalik Bey, then Minister of National Defence and now Minister of Finance, signed a contract with Mr. Lander, the Angora representative of Messrs. Vickers, for the supply of certain war material. At the time, the Minister confided to Mr. Lander that payment would be made partly out of funds earmarked for the purpose in the budget of the Ministry of Defence and partly out of funds to be contributed by the Turkish Aviation League. When payment fell due, the Ministry was unable to pay £80,000 of the total sum due because the Aviation League had, owing to the misuse of its funds by the Is Bankasi, failed to produce its share, and the Ministry itself was unable to make up the balance until mid-June 1932. Mr. Lander agreed to payment being postponed until that date on condition that his firm were not penalised for the late delivery of some of the material ordered.

3. On learning subsequently that the Ministry of Finance would not be in a position to pay his firm in sterling next June, Mr. Lander had an interview with Abdulhalik Bey, who, while confirming that payment must be made in sterling, declared that it would be impossible for him to make a sterling payment so soon after the beginning of the financial year. He could, however, offer payment in Turkish paper currency, and authorise Mr. Lander to purchase sterling on the open market over a period of about three months and to transfer the sterling so obtained to London. Alternatively, Mr. Lander might wait until the export season began, when the Ministry would be able to pay sterling in instalments.

4. Mr. Lander does not entertain any doubt that the Turkish Government will meet its obligations in respect of public works and military requirements, and has not requested my intervention in the matter. He holds, and I agree with him, that Abdulhalik Bey's explanation of the reasons for the delay in payment in sterling is a genuinely frank and sincere *exposé* of the actual situation, and that there is no intention on the part of the Turkish Government to evade its engagements in this connexion.

5. The importance of the incident lies in the fact that it seems to show that the Turkish Government has arrived at a point where it must either obtain money from abroad to enable it to continue its plans of reconstruction, or modify the plans.

6. There is a report current here that Saraçoğlu Sükrü Bey, who has gone to Paris to confer with the Council of the Redistributed Ottoman Debt, will seek to obtain a loan in Paris or to mortgage some of Turkey's monopolies. The fact that the Turkish Government, which up to now has been able to impose on the bondholders its view that debt discussions should be carried on in Angora, has sent its representatives to meet the bondholders in Paris, is taken by some observers to mean that the Debt discussions are a mere cloak to cover a mission to other financial quarters in Paris, and an added significance is found in the visit following closely on Saraçoglu Sükrü's American trip, which Turkey may have permitted herself to hope would remove any necessity of having recourse to Paris.

7. The British delegate on the Debt Council will possibly be able to say whether the mission's task is solely to effect a definite settlement with the bondholders, or to use the offer of a satisfactory settlement to induce Paris to grant a loan. I can only say that, for the Turkish Government to accept a French loan on any terms on which one is likely to be granted, which will certainly include some form of control or supervision of the way in which the money is spent, would be a complete reversal of the policy which the Turkish Government has consistently announced and pursued during the last six years.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 969/702/44] No. 22.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received February* 26.)

(No. 60.)

Sir, *Angora, February* 12, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 53 of the 5th instant, relative to the present position of the Moslem religion in this country, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of an interesting note by Mr. Bramwell, second secretary of His Majesty's Embassy, descriptive of the scene which he witnessed in the Mosque of St. Sophia at Constantinople during the recent celebration of the Night of Power.

2. Though Constantinople is in no way representative of Turkey as a whole, the scenes of irreverence and disorder described by Mr. Bramwell tend to confirm the feeling, expressed in paragraph 3 of my despatch under reference, that such official innovations as recitations of the Koran in Turkish are designed rather to break up the old religious traditions than to inculcate piety in any form.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 22.

Note by Mr. Bramwell.

IT may be worth while to record, as a newcomer to Turkey, my impressions on witnessing for the first time on the 3rd February the Kadir Gecesi ("Night of Power") ceremony in St. Sophia.

Let me say at once that it reminded me irresistibly of the Albert Hall in London seen from the gallery at a big boxing match when a foul has been committed or the referee's decision questioned. That is to say, that as a meeting for purposes of worship I found it disillusioning, even though as a spectacle it could hardly fail to exhilarate. Most Turks and foreigners, moreover, who had seen the ceremony in previous years, and whose views I sought, were unanimous in opining that, even compared with last year, this year's ceremony marks a decided move away from the old tradition.

The mosque was packed with people, numbering, according to the Turkish press, anything from 20,000 to 30,000, but, in my estimation, hardly more than half as many. Suffice it, at all events, that the whole ground floor was covered with people, and the first gallery, whence I had a view of the proceedings below, held spectators three deep all round its balustrade. All the approaches to the building, including the square between it and the mosque of Sultan Ahmet, were thronged throughout the service inside, and the actual entrances remained practically impassable owing to the seething mob which besieged them to get in or out. The service inside, as I have indicated, was both disappointing and disorderly. I went expecting a manifestation of unparalleled mass-devotion and respect and looking forward to witnessing the famous spectacle of thousands of heads and bodies rising and falling in perfect unison like the wind on a field of corn. Instead, what did I find? The worshippers seemed to act just as they pleased—I refer, of course, to those on the ground floor of the mosque—and during the prayers and reading of the Koran and Mevlud would stand, walk about, sit or kneel facing, apparently with complete indifference, either towards or away from Mecca. I was not alone of those with me to notice that many had not troubled to take off their shoes in order to participate in the service. Flashlight photographs were continually being taken. There was even at one moment a free fight between two soldiers, which gave rise to an incredible hubbub

and the most unseemly whistles and cat-calls, above which the chanting of the *hafiz* could not be distinguished.

I have heard two theories advanced to explain the state of affairs I have just tried to describe. The first, which has appeared in the press, is that this is the first "grande prière" in the history of St. Sophia at which the Koran and Mevlud have been read in the Turkish language, and that the unprecedented crowd in the mosque had assembled out of curiosity. The second, which is not entirely unconnected with the first, is that they had come to see the Gazi, who was rumoured to be coming to the service. (Incidentally, I might mention that he did not come.) Whatever the true explanation may be, there is every reason, as His Majesty's Ambassador's despatch by to-day's bag to the Foreign Office implies, to attach special significance to what may be termed Mustafa Kemal's latest "feeler" towards some form of Moslem revival in Turkey. But despite the claim, which I have read in at least one Turkish newspaper, that the introduction of the Koran in Turkish into the mosques will infallibly lead to such a revival, it will take more than my recent experience in St. Sophia to convince me that this is imminent on any appreciable scale, at all events in Constantinople, and that those in authority will not find it immeasurably more difficult than they imagine to build up in a new-Turkish and independent guise the ancient religion that they have so far successfully contributed to undermine.

C. B.

February 6, 1932.

[E 971/33/34] No. 23.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received February* 26.)

(No. 63.)

Sir, *Angora, February* 15, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 9 of the 6th January last, I have the honour to report that the Persian Ambassador has informed the military attaché to His Majesty's Embassy that the Shah and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs were able to settle by a short discussion the details of the frontier agreement, regarding which the Turkish and Persian General Staffs had, after protracted negotiations, arrived at a complete deadlock.

2. Sadek Khan also informed Major O'Leary that the Turkish General Staff had rejected the proposal to divert the Trebizond–Maku road so that it should pass through Bezirgan, on the pretext that the last-named place was situated in a military zone.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 1246/253/44] No. 24.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received March* 11.)

(No. 85.)

Sir, *Angora, March* 1, 1932.

WITH reference to Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 379 of the 16th November, 1931, regarding the readmission of exchangeable Orthodox Greeks to Turkey subject to certain restrictions, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying extracts(1) from recent issues of the Constantinople newspaper the "République" embodying further regulations which have received the approval of the Council of Ministers. By virtue of these new regulations the concessions granted to such persons have been amplified to the extent that they may now stay in Turkey for a period not exceeding three months, instead of only two as previously.

2. It will be seen also that "fugitive" Turkish citizens who left the country without Turkish passports, with the exception of the 150 "undesirables,"

(1) Not printed.

and those who were expelled on account of their belonging to the Imperial Family, may, after applying for and receiving a certificate of Turkish nationality and a Turkish passport from a Turkish consul, return to this country, presumably for good. The same treatment will be meted out to both Moslem and non-Moslem Turkish citizens who return under these conditions.

3. A further important concession has also been made in the case of non-Moslem Turks resident in Turkey, in that they are now free to travel within the country and to sell and purchase property at will. They have hitherto been under the necessity of obtaining special authorisation to travel, and have been forbidden to exercise property rights outside their place of residence. This regulation places them on an equal footing with their Moslem compatriots in such matters, and there seems every reason to believe, in general, that what the minority clauses of the Treaty of Lausanne signally failed to effect is now in a fair way to being realised as a logical outcome of the new-born Græco-Turkish friendship.

4. The regulations of the 17th November, 1930, to which reference is made in article 4 of the new regulations, will be found in Rizzo, "La Legislation Turque," vol. IX, pp. 184–186.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 1313/70/44] No. 25.

Department of Overseas Trade to Foreign Office.—(*Received March* 14.)

THE Comptroller-General of the Department of Overseas Trade presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and transmits herewith copy of Angora Despatch No. O.T. (A.) No. 5 dated the 4th March, 1932, respecting the financial situation in Turkey.

Department of Overseas Trade, March 11, 1932.

Enclosure in No. 25.

Embassy, Angora, to Sir John Simon.

(No. O.T. (A.) 5.) (Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora, March* 4, 1932.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 2 of the 2nd instant, regarding the intention of the Ministry of National Defence to postpone until 1936 payments falling due this year in respect of munitions supplied by foreign contractors, I have the honour to give the following details:—

2. On the 1st March the Minister summoned the Angora representatives of the following companies:—

Vickers-Armstrongs, Schneider, Skoda, Bofors (heavy guns),
Ansaldo, Cantiere Navale (destroyers),
Chantiers de Saint-Nazaire (repairs to the "Yavuz"),
Fabrique nationale, Liége, Gorz, Erhardt, &c. (small-arms),

and informed them that as the existing crisis showed no signs of abating as far as Turkey was concerned, he was forced to propose to them that all payments due in the financial year 1932 (*i.e.*, June 1932–May 1933) should be postponed until 1936. He asked them to recommend their principals to accept this postponement, and, while not objecting to pay interest in consideration of postponement, suggested that it should be fixed as low as 2 per cent.

3. This communication, as might be expected, caused consternation among the foreign contractors, the more so as they were unable to obtain any very convincing assurances that the payments due in 1933, 1934 and 1935 would be

effected on the stipulated dates. Their dissatisfaction is increased by the knowledge that the Ministry, while professing to be unable to pay them, can yet find money for increasing its air defence, and they are astonished that the Ministry has not offered to pay a percentage, however, small, of its debts to them.

4. Mr. Lander, representative of Messrs. Vickers-Armstrongs, who has given me the above information, asked the Minister of National Defence whether the decision to postpone the 1932 payments would affect the payment of the £80,000 referred to in Sir G. Clerk's despatch O.T.(A) No. 4 of the 3rd February to you. Zekâi Bey, while abounding in professions of satisfaction for the friendliness now prevailing between Turkey and Great Britain, and referring to Ismet's Pasha's pleasure at this state of affairs, declared that this sum would have to be included in the proposed postponement, but that he would try to have some part of it paid in 1932.

5. The action of the Ministry confirms the statement of Mr. Wyatt, referred to in your despatch No. 72 of the 25th February to the effect that Turkey needs a large sum of money immediately. With regard to Mr. Wyatt's further statement about the cession of the Turkish tobacco monopoly, the Anatolian Agency on the 2nd March announced that it was authorised to deny the report published by certain newspapers to the effect that the tobacco monopoly would be ceded to a foreign group in return for an advance of 250 million dollars.

I have, &c.

[E 1444/35/93] No. 26.

The Council of Ministers, Baqdad, to the High Commission for Iraq.—(Communicated by Colonial Office, March 21.)

(Strictly Secret.) *Baqdad, February 20, 1932.*

I AM directed to forward to you herewith, for the information of His Excellency the High Commissioner, copies of the letters exchanged between His Excellency Nuri Pasha and the Turkish Government regarding certain matters which were discussed at Angora last January.

ABDUL QADIR RASHID,
Secretary to the Council of Ministers.

Enclosure 1 in No. 26.

Nuri Pasha to Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

(Translation.)
(Secret.)

Wazir Beg Effendi, *Angora, January 10, 1932.*

WITH reference to the conversation we have had together on the subject of the grant of reductions of customs duty on certain products of Turkish origin, I beg to inform your Excellency that my Government will arrange for the necessary legal measures to be adopted for the reduction by one-third of the customs duty at present leviable on afs (gallnuts) and firewood entering (? Iraq) from Turkey, and also for the reduction by one-third of the customs duty on sheep and goats provided that "that" (? the duty after such reduction, or the reduction of one-third) shall not be less than the "count tax" (*per capita* tax) leviable within Iraq.

I have, &c.
Prime Minister of Iraq,
NURI AS SAID

Enclosure 2 in No. 26.

Turkish Minister of Economics to Nuri Pasha.

(Translation.)
(Secret.)

Hazrat Pasha Rais, *Angora, January 10, 1932.*

WITH reference to the conversation we have had together on the subject of Iraqi dates.

I have the honour to confirm to your Excellency that my Government will take legal measures for reducing by one-third the customs duty at present leviable on dates, and (? to state) that my Government have approved of the (? value of the) quota for the date import season of 1932 being fixed at 100,000 liras.

Please accept, &c.
Minister of Economics,
M. SHARAF.

Enclosure 3 in No. 26.

Turkish Minister of Economics to Nuri Pasha.

(Translation.)

Wazir Beg Effendi,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 4th January, 1932, and to state as follows in regard to the matters dealt with therein:—

1. I confirm with gratification that we are agreed that the 10 per cent. share payable by the Iraqi Government to the Government of the Turkish Republic under article 14 of the treaty of 1926 is considered by the Iraqi Government (? to be payable) with effect from the year 1931 for a period of twenty-five years, that it shall be paid on the "condition" (? understanding) that payment shall cover the whole area provided for in the concession agreement of 1925, and that if, for any reason, one or more years shall lapse without payment being made, the share in respect of such years shall be paid separately.

2. Agreement having been reached to accept the year 1931 for the commencement of payment, naturally the extension period of one year, four months and eight days, previously dealt with, is no longer to be taken account of.

3. The year 1931 having been fixed as the commencement of the (period of) twenty-five years under discussion, the fixation of a (date of) commencement subsequent to that date (? 1931) for any share payable by Iraq to Turkey becomes out of question.

4. It is agreed that, apart from all the receipts dealt with in the letter dated the 24th March, 1931, addressed by the Iraqi Government to the Iraq Petroleum Company (Limited), the contents of which were accepted by the said company, and apart from the amounts receivable by the Iraqi Government on account of income tax and of the local fee known in Iraq by the name of "nukus" (*i.e.*, excise fees) and of municipal fees on sales within the frontiers of Iraq by the new company or companies to be formed, the right of Turkey, *i.e.*, its share of 10 per cent. of other receipts, shall be reserved.

5. I suggest that the two Governments should take in hand, at the earliest possible date, the necessary legal steps for the amendment of article 14 of the treaty of 1926.

6. I beg to submit that the date question dealt with in your letter has been settled (in agreement) between us by means of a separate exchange of notes.

Minister of Economics,
M. SHARAF.

January 10, 1932.

Enclosure 4 in No. 26.

Nuri Pasha to Turkish Minister of Economics.

(Translation.)
Wazir Beg Effendi,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 10th January, 1932, and to state as follows in regard to the matters dealt with therein :—

1. I confirm with gratification that we are agreed that the 10 per cent. share payable by the Iraqi Government to the Government of the Turkish Republic under article 14 of the treaty of 1926 is considered by the Iraqi Government (? to be payable) with effect from the year 1931 for a period of twenty-five years, that it shall be paid on the "condition" (? understanding) that payment shall cover the whole area provided for in the concession agreement of 1925, and that if, for any reason, one or more years shall lapse without payment being made, the share in respect of such years shall be paid separately.

2. Agreement having been reached to accept the year 1931 for the commencement of payment, naturally the extension period of one year, four months and eight days, previously dealt with, is no longer to be taken account of.

3. The year 1931 having been fixed as the commencement of the (period of) twenty-five years under discussion, the fixation of a (date of) commencement subsequent to that date (? 1931) for any share payable by Iraq to Turkey becomes out of question.

4. It is agreed that, apart from all the receipts dealt with in the letter dated the 24th March, 1931, addressed by the Iraqi Government to the Iraq Petroleum Company (Limited), the contents of which were accepted by the said company, and apart from the amounts receivable by the Iraqi Government on account of income tax and of the local fee known in Iraq by the name of "nukus" (*i.e.*, excise fees) and of municipal fees on sales within the frontiers of Iraq by the new company or companies to be formed, the right of Turkey, *i.e.*, its share of 10 per cent. of other receipts, shall be reserved.

5. It is, however, natural that the British Government, who is concerned in this question and who is a signatory of the Treaty of Angora of 1926, should be informed and her opinion ascertained as to whether or not she wishes to take part in the discussions which are to take place between us. Upon the receipt of a reply from the said Government, representatives of the two parties will meet at a place to be determined and submit to their respective Governments and Parliaments, as early as possible, the amendments to be introduced into the relevant article of the treaty of 1926 within the bases outlined hereinabove.

6. I beg to submit that the date question dealt with in your letter has been settled (in agreement) between us by means of a separate exchange of notes.

Prime Minister of Iraq,
NURI AS SAID.

January 10, 1932.

Enclosure 5 in No. 26.

Turkish Minister of the Interior to Nuri Pasha.

(Translation.)
Angora, January 10, 1932.

Hazrat Prime Minister,

IN the course of the conversation which took place between us your Excellency suggested, for the purpose of facilitating the maintenance of security and order on the frontier, that the two parties should set up, at the points where the Zab and Khabour came in contact with the frontier and at suitable seasons of the years, a number of "detachments" (*sic*) each under one officer, the strength of each of which and the place to be occupied by it to be determined on the spot by the frontier commanders and the nearest administrative officials of the two parties, and that these "detachments" should be provided with quick and sure means of communication in order to notify one another and the (public) security and "intizar" (reserve) forces behind them of such events as are likely to occur.

I have the honour to inform his Hazrat the Pasha that the Ministry of Interior has instructed the officials concerned to adopt the necessary measures for co-operation on these lines between the two friendly neighbouring States for the purpose of ensuring the maintenance of security and order on the frontiers.

Minister of Interior,
H. QAYA.

Enclosure 6 in No. 26.

Turkish Minister of Economics to Nuri Pasha.

(Translation.)

A PROPOS of the signature to-day of the treaty of commerce by representatives of Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to make the following statements to your Excellency :—

1. Customs formalities relating to the entry into and exit from Turkey of goods of Iraqi origin passing in transit to the territories of another country, or to goods of foreign origin passing through Turkey in transit to Iraq, will be carried out only in the Nissibin customs-house in Turkey.

It should, however, be pointed out, in addition to the above, that the confining of transit formalities to the Nissibin customs-house shall not prevent import and export formalities and formalities agreed upon provisionally with Iraq being carried out at the said customs-house.

2. The three under-mentioned customs "administrations" (? houses) have been assigned for (the carrying out of) formalities of importation and exportation of goods and formalities provisionally agreed upon with Iraq :—

(*a*) Jazrah customs-house : for the inland water route Mosul–Faishkhabour–Diarbakr.

(*b*) Ashuta customs-house (with Kurur as headquarters) or the Sharkijal (with Jal as headquarters) for the Mosul–Dohuk–Amadiyah–Julemark route.

(*c*) Jazrah customs-house for the Mosul–Zakho–Sanat–Sa'irt or Diarbakr route.

3. The change of the above customs post as may be necessary, the affixation of customs seal and signature on transit certificates at the respective customs-houses and other matters provided for in the customs laws and regulations of the two parties, will be determined in direct communication between the most senior official of the Turkish customs-house and the most senior official of the Iraqi customs-house.

Please accept, &c.
Minister of Economics,
January 10, 1932. M. SHARAF.

[E 1625/35/93] Enclosure 7 in No. 26.

Nuri Pasha to the Chief Turkish Plenipotentiary.

(Translation.)

IN connexion with the signature to-day of the treaty of commerce "between" (? by) the delegates of Iraq and Turkey, I have the honour to make the following statements to your Excellency :—

(1) Customs formalities concerning the entry and exit in transit of goods of Turkish origin passing through Iraq to the territories of another country, or of goods of foreign origin passing through Iraq in transit to Turkey, will be carried out in Iraq at the Mosul customs-house only.

To the above should, however, be added that the confining of transit formalities to the Mosul customs-house shall not preclude import and export formalities and (? other) formalities temporarily admissible with Turkey being, in the meantime, carried out at the said customs-house.

(2) The under-mentioned three customs offices are assigned for formalities of the importation and exportation of goods and formalities (? transactions) temporarily admissible with Turkey :—

(*a*) Feishkhabour customs-house: for the inland water route Mosul–Feishkhabour–Diarbakir.

(*b*) Amadiyah customs-house: for the route Mosul–Dohuk–Amadiyah–Julemark.

(*c*) Zakho customs-house: for the route Mosul–Zakho–Sanat–Sairt or Diarbakir.

(3) Any change, as may be necessary, in the customs posts mentioned above and the grant (or exchange: Arabic not clear) of seals and signatures on transit certificates at the respective customs departments and other matters set forth (? provided for) in the customs laws and regulations of the respective parties will be determined in direct communication between the most senior officer of the Iraqi Customs Administration and the most senior officer of the Turkish Customs Administration.

Please accept, &c.
NURI AS SAID,
Chief Iraqi Delegate.

January 10, 1932.

Enclosure 8 in No. 26.

Memorandum.

(Translation.)

IN the course of discussion of the extradition treaty between Iraq and Turkey, the question what are the States whose nationals will be extraditable under the said treaty was considered. After agreement had been reached that no national of either high contracting party may be delivered to the other high contracting party, Nuri Pasha, the plenipotentiary of the Iraqi Government, expressed a desire that the extradition of foreigners under the treaty should be optional for the two parties; and, although the treaty was drafted accordingly, he added and affirmed that the Iraqi Government would exercise and apply the right of option in a positive manner, *i.e.*, it will favour the grant of extradition of foreigners unless the same be contrary to its higher interests, and that, in particular, it would adhere to the course of grant of extradition in the case of nationals of the States of Syria and Persia as far as such course might be compatible with the general provisions of extradition treaties.

The Turkish plenipotentiary accepted the point of view of Nuri Pasha, taking the Pasha's statement as a pledge, and in his turn stated that Turkey would exercise the right of option to be obtained by it in this behalf in a positive way, *i.e.*, it would favour the grant of extradition of foreigners unless the same be contrary to its higher interests, and that, in particular, it would adhere to the course of grant of extradition in the case of nationals of the States of Syria and Persia as far as such course might be compatible with the general provisions of extradition treaties.

Consequently, a clause was inserted in article 1 of the extradition treaty providing that extradition will be optional.

M. SHARAF. NURI AS SAID.

Angora, January 9, 1932.

[E 1520/30/44] No. 27.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received March* 29.)

(No. 101.)

Sir, *Angora, March* 18, 1932.

WITH reference to Mr. Henderson's despatch No. 14 of the 5th January, 1931, on the subject of the appointment of Naji Shevket Bey as Iraqi Minister at Angora, I have the honour to report that His Royal Highness the Emir Zeid presented the letters accrediting him as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister

Plenipotentiary of His Majesty the King of Iraq to the President of the Turkish Republic on the 12th March, 1932.

2. The speeches exchanged on this occasion do not present any features that call for comment beyond a reference in that of His Royal Highness to the pleasure and gratitude with which His Majesty King Feisal was able to observe the friendliness and sympathy of the Gazi and the Turkish Government during the course of his visit to Angora last July.

3. In the course of an interview given to representatives of the Constantinople press on his arrival in Turkey, His Royal Highness, in reply to questions, disclaimed any official knowledge of the intention of King Feisal to accept the crown of Syria. He added that, as an Arab, he naturally desired the happiness and prosperity of the Syrians. Asked about the British mandate in Iraq, the Emir Zeid declared that this mandate, which Iraqis had never recognised in principle, had been withdrawn by decision of the League of Nations in January of this year. He went on to say that as a result of the conclusion of a recent Anglo-Iraq treaty there were no longer any British troops in his country. Authority had, however, been given for the use of some Iraqi aerodromes for the purposes of the air service between England and India.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN

[E 1521/1521/44] No. 28.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received March* 29.)

(No. 102.)

Sir, *Angora, March* 17, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a despatch which I have received from His Majesty's consul-general in Smyrna on the subject of the seizure by the Turkish authorities of the Smyrna Quay Company on the grounds of fraudulent and corrupt conduct of its affairs.

2. The authorities in Smyrna have for some years past fixed a covetous eye on the functions and resources of the Quay Company, and it is reasonably certain that, being now possessed of the useful weapon provided by the company's mismanagement of its affairs, they will not hesitate to exact the maximum penalty prescribed by law. I agree with the observation made by Mr. Greig in paragraph 8 of his despatch that foreign enterprises in Turkey are driven by the measures of the Government and the rapacity of its officials to resort to bribery of the local functionaries in order to preserve their existence, and the outcome of this affair, which is still *sub judice*, will be awaited with interest and possibly with concern by many other foreign enterprises established in this country.

3 A point of interest which has emerged since the date of Mr. Greig's despatch is that a certain Emin Bey, the Government commissioner appointed some years ago to supervise the activities of the company, has absconded to Switzerland with a large amount of money which he had succeeded in accumulating in the accomplishment of his duties. It is reported that the Turkish Government are anxious to secure his extradition in order that proceedings may be taken against him for his share in the company's illegal activities, but as yet it is impossible to state whether they will be successful.

4. The case has recently provoked Falih Rifki Bey, the editor of the semi-official newspaper "Hakimiyeti Milliye," to reflect, in a leading article which appeared in that paper two days ago, on the contrast between the attitude displayed towards bribery and corruption under the old régime and that which prevails in Republican Turkey. Under the Ottoman Empire bribery was a constant tradition, and it was not considered at all immoral to appropriate money which really belonged to the Treasury. The Smyrna case, he continues, is an echo of those times. The time is past when bribery can be condoned, and now every citizen is considered to be the guardian of State property. The Ottoman Government, thoroughly discredited by reason of its own corrupt ways, provoked similar conduct on the part of its citizens, but the new Turkey has established a tradition

of honourable government. In the old days it was impossible to conceive of business being conducted without bribery, and the article concludes with the hope that the Smyrna case will be a final lesson to adventurers of this type, who are bound to be the losers in the end.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

Enclosure in No. 28.

Consul-General Greig to Sir G. Clerk.

(No. 10.)
Sir, *Smyrna, February* 16, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 7th instant the proceedings instituted by the Government against the French Quay Company of Smyrna, concerning which a note is subjoined, were carried a step further by the arrest and imprisonment of the following French citizens:—

M. Jourdan, who represents the board of directors in France and had come to Turkey in connexion with the recent developments.

M. Yves Guiffray, who succeeded to the managership of the company in Smyrna on the death of his father, M. Elzéar Guiffray, in 1930.

M. Péré, who has been the company's accountant in Smyrna since 1930.

2. These persons are confined in prison, where the accommodation assigned to them collectively is a single empty room in which they are allowed to have their own bedding and meals of their own ordering. They are permitted to receive relatives and have been visited by the acting French consul-general, who tells me that their surroundings are tolerable from the sanitary standpoint. The French Embassy in Angora is endeavouring, he says, to obtain their release on bail.

Note on the Position of the Quay Company.

3. A protracted enquiry held into the accounts and management of the Société des Quais de Smyrne, a French enterprise founded in 1891, took a sensational turn on the 11th January when the offices and property of the company were seized by order of the Council of Ministers, its administration being temporarily entrusted to one Hulusi Bey, a former mayor of the town.

4. For an obvious purpose the seizure was stage-managed with the maximum of spectacular ostentation, the officials present including the Vali, the chief of police, the public prosecutor, the director of the Port Monopoly, and the commissioner superintending the Izmir–Kasaba Railway. A score of policemen accompanied them.

5. Justification for the drastic action taken by the executive is claimed on the following main grounds:—

(1) That the company has defrauded the Turkish Government, which is entitled to 50 per cent. of the net receipts, of a legitimate share (*a*) of the compensation awarded to it by the Inter-Allied Commission on account of war losses and (*b*) of the proceeds of certain sales of land.

To charge (*a*) the company replies that Turkish calculations have overlooked the exclusion from the compensation awarded of any provision for the losses of enemy alien shareholders.

Charge (*b*) is combated by the contention that the land in question was privately owned and therefore no concern of the company.

(2) That the company has defaulted in respect of an obligation to set up storage for petroleum.

The company's rejoinder to this charge is to the effect that in pre-war days the storage was not provided in consequence of the reluctance of the Turkish Government itself to override objections formulated by Russia in the interests of her own oil industry; and that at a later date the Standard Oil Company and Steaua Romana were permitted, despite the Quay Company's protests, to divert anticipated profits by building storage of their own.

(3) That the company has kept double sets of account-books and registers for purposes of deception.

In traversing this charge the company pleads that within recent years its books have stood the test of scrutiny by several commissions appointed by the Ministry to report on all outstandings as between itself and the Government.

6. The evidence on which the charges of fraud are based appears to have been supplied to the authorities mainly by two former employees of the company of French nationality, named Joseph Armao and Fernand Caporal, who had been the trusted confidants of the former manager, M. Elzéar Guiffray. These too powerful dictators were removed when the managership was inherited by his son, M. Yves Guiffray, in 1930. The betrayal now perpetrated by them is generally ascribed to thirst for lucre and revenge.

7. There is every reason to suppose that the appropriation of the profitable services carried on by the Société des Quais, for which the irregularities alleged will doubtless prove a plausible pretext, has long been contemplated by the Government. Persons intimate with the history of the enterprise are able, indeed, to point out that both the Smyrna Port Monopoly and the Smyrna Municipality, who are competing with avidity to-day for the future control of its resources, have repeatedly represented to the Ministry the advantages realisable by its acquisition. The official attitude would seem, moreover, to have been instructively revealed in 1923. In that year the company is understood to have applied for an extension of its concession, which would normally expire seven years hence, undertaking to electrify the tramway service which has been an important factor in its activities. In reply it was informed that acquiescence would be conditional on its becoming a Turkish concern. Shortly afterwards two successive commissions were appointed to examine its books without, however, reporting the detection of incriminating matter.

8. That the managership of the Quay Company, which is now undergoing preliminary examination, will eventually be declared guilty on some, at least, of the counts relating to fraud or corruption is a consummation very generally expected here. It is, however, commonly argued that, but for acquiescence in bribery, no enterprise dependent on official goodwill or immunity from obstruction would long survive in this country.

9. In the European business circles of Smyrna the present episode has enhanced a growing sense of insecurity, the view being taken that the indifference to legality officially displayed in the case of the Quay Company constitutes a dangerous precedent; and apprehension is freely expressed that predatory hands may now be laid at any moment on coveted enterprises with impunity.

10. It is, I venture to think, a fair comment on the subject of this despatch in its wider aspect that by white men of every nation, who, domiciled in Asia, realise the price to be paid for the self-effacement of Europe in Turkey, the extinction in sordid circumstances of an enterprise sustained for forty years under the ægis of a great Western Power can only be contemplated as an event of sinister omen.

I have, &c.
C. A. GREIG.

[**E 1541/1541/44**] No. 29.

Mr. Waterlow to Sir John Simon.—(*Received March* 30.)

(No. 62.)
Sir, *Sofia, March* 17, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that, at the invitation of the Bulgarian Government, Tevfik Rüstü Bey, the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, broke his journey at Sofia on his way back to Angora from the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, arriving here on the evening of the 11th instant and leaving on that of the 13th. Of the two nights thus spent by his Excellency in this capital, the first was occupied by an official dinner given in his honour by the Bulgarian Government, and the second in dining with me privately and quietly at His Majesty's Legation. He was received by King Boris. The Turkish Minister

invited the chief members of the Government, the heads of missions and other personalities to meet him at luncheon, and a large-scale reception was held in his honour at the Italian Legation.

2. To summarise the speeches made by Tevfik Rüştü Bey during these two days and the flood of declarations that he poured out to the press would be both wearisome and pointless; suffice it to say that, if the object of the visit was to demonstrate once more that Bulgaria has at least one hearty friend in the world, that object was completely attained. Nothing could be more fulsome than the cordiality displayed on both sides. It may, however, perhaps be of some interest if I record the impressions that I gathered from the private conversation of his Excellency during the four hours for which the full brunt of his *cacoethes loquendi* was borne, almost single-handed, by myself.

3. The central impression that stands out in retrospect is the definiteness with which, from the Turkish point of view, Europe divides up into two opposed camps; on the one side France and the Little *Entente*, on the other side the rest; the former a danger to Turkey, the latter offering possibilities of arrangements by which her position may be protected. All that his Excellency said to me on topics of immediate and local interest fitted into this scheme; the scorn he poured on the idea of a Danubian Federation, which, for him, was a typical product of Geneva, conceived by people who knew nothing of Central European or Balkan realities, either economic or political, and capable of no practical expression except perhaps as a reinforcement of French influence; the conviction he displayed that the familiar Yugoslav thesis of an "integral Yugoslavia" extending from the Alps to the Black Sea was a political impossibility; the vehemence with which he insisted that a strong and independent Bulgaria—the only purely Balkan State—was a necessity both for Balkan equilibrium and for Turkey's very existence; and, finally, the ardour of his desire to see Bulgaria and Greece reconciled and co-operating.

4. As to the last point, he admitted that nothing could be done for the moment. Nothing, indeed, could be done anywhere until the Reparations Conference in June had set the wheels of finance revolving again and had reopened the London market; that was why the Turks had lain low at the last Constantinople meeting of the Council of the Balkan Conference (see last paragraph of the enclosure in my despatch No. 42 of the 16th February), since he had been convinced that it would be dangerous to press prematurely for Græco-Bulgarian harmony. But when the right moment should come Turkey would do everything in her power to further a settlement of Græco-Bulgarian differences. The resulting Turco-Græco-Bulgarian friendship and economic co-operation would not be a "front" directed against anyone; it would merely be a natural arrangement dictated by geographical and economic conditions, and, as such, it was, in his opinion, the only basis on which appeasement and recovery in this part of the world could be founded. Turkey had every reason to wish to see it brought about, for he fully realised that the alternative was that, sooner or later, she might have to reckon with the danger of an "integral Yugoslavia," in which Bulgaria would disappear as a national entity.

5. The point that was new to me in all this—and it seems to me instructive—was a certain hysteria in his Excellency's view of this danger, even while he scouted it as a possibility in any foreseeable future. An "integral Yugoslavia," he said, would mean the absorption by the Little *Entente*, not merely of Bulgaria, but inevitably of Salonica and of Constantinople also, and—who could say?—probably ultimately of Angora. This gave the measure of his anxiety to see Greece and Bulgaria reconciled. It was so great that, if Turkey were not so poor, he would pay the difference between Græco-Bulgarian financial claims himself to-day. That would be cheaper than sending a million Turks to fight round Adrianople.

6. Throughout this discourse so marked a suspicion of France and the Little *Entente* appeared as naturally to suggest that one of the objects of Tevfik Rüştü's perambulations has been the cementing of some kind of understanding with Italy. My French colleague draws this conclusion from the forwardness displayed by the Italian Minister during Tevfik Rüştü's visit. M. Cora was the only foreign representative here to emulate the Turkish Minister by inviting the whole official and social world of Sofia to meet his Excellency.

7. On another connected topic I was struck rather by what his Excellency did not say than by what he said. In the course of a press interview he was

asked whether Turkey intended to mediate between Bulgaria and the Soviet Union with a view to the resumption of, at any rate, commercial relations; to which he replied that the Bulgarian Government had not asked for Turkish mediation, but that, should the request be forthcoming, the task would be one that Turkey, as the warm friend of both parties, would undertake with lively pleasure. In talking to me, his Excellency confined himself to praise of Russian statesmanship. But I have a distinct impression that one of his objects here, perhaps at the instigation of Moscow, was to explore the possibilities of drawing Bulgaria and the Soviet Union together—a conception entirely in line with the attitude described above—and that the exploration has been fruitless for the moment. The Bulgarian Government, perturbed as they are by the growth of Communist propaganda, have no intention of entering upon official relations with Russia; and they have let this be known.

8. His Excellency congratulated himself upon the non-existence of any troublesome questions between Turkey and Great Britain, and he expressed great satisfaction at the prospect of a visit from you, Sir, in the early summer. He said that, having signed a treaty of arbitration with the United States, he intended to visit Washington in the autumn via London.

9. I asked his Excellency what progress was being made towards a settlement of Turco-Bulgarian disputes as to the liquidation of the properties of refugees, for which commissions have been set up. He said that he did not know and did not much care; the matter was of no importance and would settle itself in time. This question, however, together with the study of measures to stimulate Turco-Bulgarian trade, has been put forward officially as the sole object of Tevfik Rüştü's visit. I enclose a communiqué on the subject.

10. Copies of this despatch have been sent to His Majesty's representatives at Angora, Athens and Belgrade.

I have, &c.
S. P. WATERLOW.

Enclosure in No. 29

Extract from the "Bulgarie" of March 15, 1932.

LES NÉGOCIATIONS TURCO-BULGARES.

AU cours des entretiens qui se sont poursuivis ces jours-ci entre le Président du Conseil de Bulgarie M. Mouchanov et le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie Tevfik Ruchdi Bey, pendant son séjour à Sofia, il a été décidé que le Gouvernement bulgare enverrait prochainement à Ankara deux délégués qui s'y aboucheront avec les délégués que nommera le Gouvernement turc pour analyser les rapports présentés par les commissions turque et bulgare chargées d'étudier les possibilités d'une extension des échanges économiques entre la Turquie et la Bulgarie. Il s'agit d'assurer tout le développement possible au commerce turco-bulgare pour renforcer la collaboration amicale des deux pays.

Les deux Ministres se sont également entretenus des pourparlers turco-bulgares, engagés à Sofia au sujet de l'interprétation et de l'exécution du protocole annexe au traité d'amitié du 18 octobre 1925, relatif à la liquidation des biens des réfugiés turcs et bulgares. La partie interprétative des pourparlers étant terminée et les délégués bulgares ayant remis au délégué turc un exposé complet de leurs vues sur le principal litige d'interprétation, celui qui concerne la distinction entre les émigrés provisoirement rentrés et ceux qui se sont réinstallés dans leur pays d'origine, le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie a promis au Président du Conseil de Bulgarie de faire examiner le mémorandum bulgare dans un esprit de conciliation amicale et d'envoyer prochainement à son représentant à Sofia la réponse du Gouvernement turc, afin que ce petit différend tranché, on puisse procéder à l'établissement du mode d'exécution du protocole dans l'intérêt des deux pays.

[N 2049/1277/97] No. 30.

Sir R. Maconachie to Sir John Simon.—(Received April 4.)

(No. 39. Confidential.)

Sir, *Kabul, March* 10, 1932.

ON the 7th March the Foreign Minister, in the course of a discussion on subjects of local interest, suddenly asked me what the present attitude of His Majesty's Government was towards Turkey. I said that, so far as I was aware, the relations between the two Governments were very cordial, but the subject was not one of which I was competent to speak, and, if his Excellency required authoritative information regarding it, he would no doubt seek this in another quarter.

2. Faiz Muhammed went on to say that he had recently received a communication from the Turkish Government expressing their entire concurrence with King Nadir Shah's policy of co-operation with His Majesty's Government, as being best calculated to promote the true interests of Afghanistan. This message, Faiz Muhammed remarked, did not in any way affect the views of the Afghan Government, who had already made their decision, but was of interest as evidence of a growing inclination on the part of Turkey towards closer relations with Great Britain. The situation of Turkey was in many respects similar to that of Afghanistan. Both were on the defensive, and Russia was a danger to both. In the past, both had had good reason to suspect the attitude of His Majesty's Government towards themselves, but Afghanistan was satisfied that there was no longer ground for such suspicions, and had decided that sincere friendship with His Majesty's Government was her best safeguard for the future. Apart from the message he had mentioned, he had lately received other information to show that Turkey was now moving in the same direction. The contrast between the present position of Mr. Lloyd George and that held by him in 1918 seemed to give ground for hope that His Majesty's Government might now be ready for more cordial relations with the Turkish Republic. He thought that a rapprochement of Turkey and Afghanistan with Great Britain, rather than with Russia, would not only be to the interest of these two countries, but would also make for the peace of Asia. In the case of Afghanistan, such a development was already a fact, and in the case of Turkey, it would, with any encouragement from His Majesty's Government, surely come. Relations between the Soviet and the Turkish Governments were not so good as they appeared on the surface to be. Turkey was afraid of Russian penetration, while the growth of the Pan-Turanian idea was a real cause of anxiety to the Soviet.

3. Faiz Muhammed asked if I knew of the idea to which he referred. I replied that I did, and had recently heard Hikmet Bey upholding it as a theory, but understood that for all practical purposes it had died with Enver Pasha. Faiz Muhammed said that this was not so. It was still widely held as a political creed in Russian Turkestan, and was being deliberately fostered by the Turkish Government. Musa Jharulla and Zaki Walidi were now at Constantinople, working for this movement, and spreading their ideas by means of their newspaper, the "Yangi Turkestan."

4. The information available here regarding Musa Jharulla and Zaki Walidi is given in the extract appended to this despatch.

5. A copy of this despatch is being forwarded to the Secretary of State for India and to the Government of India.

I have, &c.
R. R. MACONACHIE.

Enclosure in No. 30.

Note of Conversation with the Afghan Foreign Minister on June 22, 1931.

I MENTIONED Musa Jharulla to the Foreign Minister to-day, and suggested that the Government of India's information did not quite bear out the Afghan Government's opinion of his character and sentiments.

Faiz Muhammed said he would give me all the information he had.

He had known Musa Jharulla personally since 1921, when he had met him at Tashkent. He was a learned philosopher with little practical sense or judgment. The Bolshevik doctrines had appealed to him greatly in the form in which they were first presented to the Moslems of Central Asia, promising them liberty, self-determination and equality.

Musa Jharulla was at one time mixed up with Barkatullah, and busily engaged in teaching that bolshevism was in no way opposed to Islam. He had considerable influence among the younger of his countrymen, and one of them with whom he was most closely associated, Zaki Walidi, rose to be President of the Tataristan or Bashgiristan Republic set up by the Bolsheviks. As such he rendered the Bolsheviks great assistance against both Denikin and Koltchak. When, however, the Bolsheviks were firm in the saddle, they began to interfere with the self-determination of the Tartars and Zaki Walidi resigned. He visited Kabul in the time of Amanullah Khan. His disillusionment had been followed by that of Musa Jharulla. The latter had attended a conference in the Hejaz as the representative of the Moslems of Central Asia, and had been allowed to do so, for their own purposes, by the Bolshevik authorities. But Musa Jharulla was at heart what Zaki Walidi was now openly, a Pan-Turanian, and hostile to the Bolshevik domination of the Central Asian Moslems. Zaki Walidi was now publishing a Pan-Turanian, anti-Bolshevik newspaper, the "Yangi Turkestan," and Musa Jharulla wished to go to Berlin to publish facts about the Bolshevik rule in Turkestan and to work for the liberation of Turkestan in conjunction with the Pan-Turanian party in Berlin and Turkey.

R. R. MACONACHIE.

June 22, 1931.

[E 1721/1721/44] No. 31.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received April 7.)

(No. 117.)

Sir, *Angora, March* 31, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a despatch(1) from the pro-consul in charge at Trebizond regarding the arrest of Communists at Samsun.

2. Recent arrests of Communists have also taken place at Constantinople, Adrianople and Brusa. Among these is a German woman named Vilda, who is alleged by the "République" to be the inspector-general of the Communist organisation in the Near East, and to have made frequent visits to Turkey during the past five years. She is reported to have been in possession, at the time of her arrest, of a large sum of money and compromising documents. Police suspicions were aroused by her visit to an imprisoned Communist named Salih Bey, alias Fuad, who, in his youth, studied in Germany.

3. The Vali of Constantinople, who was recently in Angora, told me that the Communist organisation in Constantinople was inspired from Greece, where communism was rife among workers in tobacco factories, and that he had discovered that Greek emissaries had succeeded in forming Communist cells in that city. The movement in Constantinople was probably due to the economic crisis and to unemployment, which was considerable among tobacco workers owing to the cessation of activities of American tobacco firms.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

(1) Not printed.

[E 1725/2/44] No. 32.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received April 7.)

(No. 124.)

Sir, *Angora, April* 1, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 138 of the 21st April, 1931, I have the honour to transmit to you fourteen copies of the report of the Straits Commission for the year 1931.(1)

(1) Not printed.

2. The anticipation that the dues on shipping levied by the Black Sea Life-Saving Service might be reduced during the course of the year has materialised to the extent that, as reported in my despatch No. 104 of the 18th March last, a Bill is about to be submitted to the Grand National Assembly to provide for the reduction of these dues from 5 piastres to 3 piastres per net registered ton.

3. It will be seen from p. 96 of the report that Italy again heads the list of tonnage passing through the Straits by a considerable margin. The strength of the Soviet fleet in the Black Sea, as detailed in p. 6, is as accurate as can be gauged from the data at the disposal of the commission.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[C 2930/411/22] No. 33.

Sir R. Graham to Sir John Simon.—(Received April 13.)

(No. 274.)

Sir, *Rome, April 8, 1932.*

WITH reference to despatch No. 8 from Sir George R. Clerk dated the 7th January last, I have the honour to inform you that Signor Grandi recently presented to the Fascist Grand Council his report on the recent agreement defining the international status of the islets of Castelrosso and delimiting Turco-Italian territorial waters.

2. The Treaty of Lausanne, said Signor Grandi, had allotted to Italy the islands of Stampalia, Rhodes, Calchi, Scarpanto, Caso, Piscopi, Nisiros, Calimnos, Lero, Patmos, Lisso, Simi and Cos, and the islets which depend on them, including the Island of Castelrosso. The phrasing of this treaty had, however, given rise to a dispute between Italy and Turkey about the sovereignty of certain islets depending on the Island of Castelrosso and situated between that island and the Turkish coast. The dispute was conducted at length by diplomatic means, not, however, without attempts on both sides to assert their own sovereignty over the islets in question. Eventually, a compromise was arrived at on the 30th May, 1929, by virtue of which the two parties undertook to refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. Nevertheless, the continuation of direct diplomatic negotiations rendered possible the conclusion at Angora on the 4th January last of a new agreement for the definite solution of the problem. This agreement was another proof of the atmosphere of confidence which Fascist policy has created in the relations between the two countries, and showed that the régime had been able to solve a delicate problem in the interests of dignity and justice, and by virtue of a realistic conception of Italian interests.

3. In view of the fact that it was necessary to take urgent measures to put the agreement into force in order to proceed to the exchange of ratifications before the date fixed for the hearing of the dispute by The Hague Tribunal (the 1st April, 1932), a Bill had been drafted which had obtained the approval of the Council of Ministers. To this end the Bill was also submitted to the examination of the Grand Council.

4. According to the new agreement Italy and Turkey, animated by the desire to maintain and reinforce the relations of sincere friendship existing between them, had decided to settle by direct negotiations the dispute regarding the sovereignty of the islands situated between the Anatolian coast and the Island of Castelrosso, as also that regarding the islet of of Kara Ada, and to proceed to a delimitation of the territorial waters surrounding them. Turkey's sovereignty had been recognised over certain islets, among which were Volo, Alimentaria, Caravola, &c., and over the islet of Kara Ada, situated in the Bay of Bodrum. Italian sovereignty had been recognised over the islets comprised in a zone determined by a circle with its centre at the church of Citta di Castelrosso and with a radius equal to the distance between this church and the Cape of San Stefano, that is to say, over Psoradia, Polyphados, San Giorgio, Psomi (Strongylo) Cutsumbra, &c. Apart from the islets within this circle, the islets of San Giorgio (Rho), Dragonera, Ross, Hypsili (Stronhyli) were also recognised as Italian. It had, moreover, been agreed that all the islands, islets and rocks on either side of the line of demarcation of

territorial waters defined by the present convention, whether mentioned by name or not, should belong to the State exercising sovereignty over the zone in which the said islands, islets and rocks were situated.

5. As for the territorial waters, they had been delimited in detail by a line of demarcation joining the maritime frontier between Italy and Turkey (which had not been under discussion) at a point 3 miles to the south of Tugh Burnu to the east, and at a point 3 miles to the south of the Island of Volo to the west.

I have, &c.
R. GRAHAM.

[E 1966/70/44] No. 34.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received April 21.)

(No. 127.)

Sir, *Constantinople, April 11, 1932.*

EVER since my tenure of this post I have held the view, and expressed it in my despatches, that the Turkish Government would never contract a foreign loan on conditions which imply any sort of control of its financial independence, and that, once it had arranged with foreign contractors and providers the terms on which payments would be made, those terms would be strictly adhered to, for the Government realised that only so could it build up the solid credit which would eventually enable it to obtain foreign capital on conditions acceptable to itself.

2. This was my opinion at the end of last February when I went on leave, for, though the general feeling in this country was one of uncertainty as to the future of the world and a realisation that things had probably got to be worse before they were better, there was also a general hope, not to say a conviction, that things *would* eventually be better. It was known that the Turkish Government was finding it very difficult to make revenue and expenditure meet, but it was also believed that the Government was determined to do so, and could and would succeed. When, for instance, it insisted that imports and exports must balance, and consequently there was a drastic cutting down of imports, which cost the Government at least 25 million liras in customs revenue, it was felt that, taking the long view, the Government was right. This country can, if put to it, live on its own resources without any great suffering, for the great majority of its inhabitants still desire no more than a sufficiency of bread, onions, goats' cheese, garlic, fish, coffee and cigarettes, and an occasional glass of dousico, all of which, save coffee, the country produces in abundance. Cinemas, motor cycles, "palais de danse" and such like essentials of life in Western countries are still pleasures which here are rather fearfully enjoyed, and to lack them entails no hardship. In short, it was held that few countries were better fitted to weather the economic crisis than Turkey, and that the two principles of punctual payments for foreign orders and no foreign loan except on Turkish terms would be maintained.

3. But on my return a few days ago I found the moral temperature fallen very low. The Turkish Government was said to be in the most desperate financial straits, and not only had it called its foreign creditors together and asked them to agree to a postponement of immediate payments, but it was also alleged to be seeking a foreign loan on almost any terms, and a foreign loan to-day could only mean a loan raised in Paris. Moreover, the belief was widespread that the strain between the Gazi and Ismet Pasha had reached breaking-point. The Gazi was said to have realised that the ultra-nationalistic policy of Ismet Pasha, right though it might be in principle, meant in present circumstances the bankruptcy of Turkey, whose only salvation lay in the provision of foreign capital. The Gazi had therefore made up his mind that the patriotic cry of Turkish financial independence at all cost must be toned down with as good a face as possible and an appeal made to foreign capital. He also realised that, so long as Ismet Pasha was Prime Minister, this *volte-face* was impossible, and, further, that the only man who could induce the country to swallow the pill was himself.

4. Making all allowance for the tendency of Stambul to exaggerate, I was impressed by the postponement of Government payments to foreign contractors and providers. If the Government had had to abandon the bed-rock principle on

which it was painfully building up a solid credit abroad, it must, indeed, be near collapse, and it might even be that it would justify those who, contrary to my own view, always maintained that it must eventually seek a loan in Paris, with all the conditions of foreign financial control that that would entail.

5. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs was due here on his way to Geneva just after my return, and I should have missed him if I had gone at once to Angora, I have not been able as yet to check my Constantinople impressions by the feeling in the capital, but I was fortunate enough to get Dr. Tevfik Rüştü to lunch with me on the one day he spent here, when he gave me a frank *exposé* of the financial situation. His Excellency made no attempt to minimise the financial difficulties of the Government, but said that by severe economies, which included cutting down the estimates of the Ministry of National Defence by a third, the budget would be balanced. The Government had arrived at a mutually satisfactory agreement for postponement of payments with its foreign creditors—an agreement which in one case had been of considerable advantage to one of these creditors, the Swedish Bofors Company, which had been able forthwith to sell to China, at a considerably increased price, the material for which Turkey could not at the moment pay. As for a foreign loan, the Government was quite decided to wait until the markets of London and New York—that is to say, of the whole world—were open to it on reasonable terms. This attitude as regards the loan is confirmed by a leading article in the semi-official "Milliyet," published the day after my conversation with the Minister for Foreign Affairs. The writer asserts that the policy of Ismet Pasha has been that no loan should be contracted to balance the budget, but that he was always ready to contract one for the reconstruction and development of the country, on condition that such a loan was not incompatible with Turkey's political and financial independence, and that the rate of interest and general conditions were reasonable. If the Government of the Republic has not made a loan up to now, the reason has been that it has not been able to obtain proper conditions. Turkey is ready to contract a loan, but not at the price of its independence.

6. One must discount the Foreign Minister's optimism as much as Pera pessimism, but I think that the financial situation to-day, which I have explained more fully in my despatch No. 136 of the 13th April, may be summarised as follows:—

The Government will probably be able to arrange with its foreign creditors for a postponement of some of the payments due in the current year without grave injury to its credits. There is also a hopeful feeling that a definite and practical settlement of the Ottoman debt will be reached with the bondholders. On the other hand, this financial year, 1931–32, will close on the 31st May with a deficit of somewhere about 40 million Turkish liras. About 20 million of this can be met out of economies from past years, and the balance will be extinguished by the simple process of not paying the full estimates of the various Government Departments. It must be borne in mind that the practice here has always been to make every Department work on the basis of the cash doled out to it, and not on its estimates. For instance, suppose that the Ministry of Education estimated for an increase of 5 per cent. on the salaries of certain classes of teachers, and thereby increased its demands on the public purse by some 200,000 Turkish liras, those estimates might be passed by the Grand National Assembly, but the teachers would not receive the 5 per cent. increase unless and until the money was there to pay for it, and if at the end of the year the money was still lacking, they would not receive it at all. Therefore, in a year where revenue is less than the estimated expenditure, the difference is simply cut off instead of having to be met out of the next year's income.

7. It may, then, be hoped that for this year Turkey is safe, but the limit of taxation must be very near at hand, and the new taxes which are being proposed for next year seem more likely to increase the general discontent and to paralyse trade and commerce still further than to produce a bigger revenue.

I have, &c.

GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 1968/70/44] No. 35.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received April* 21.)

(No. 136.)

Sir, *Constantinople, April* 13, 1932.

IN my despatch No. 249 of the 30th July last I had the honour to transmit tables showing the detailed budget estimates for the financial year 1931–32 as compared to the year 1930–31.

2. As shown in these tables, revenue was estimated at £T. 186,705,599 and expenditure at £T. 186,582,045, thus showing a decrease of approximately 16 per cent. compared to the estimates of the preceding year.

3. Revenue estimates were considered to be conservative. They were based on the yield for the year 1930–31, which was seriously affected by the general crisis.

4. The results to date have been very disappointing and it is feared that the total revenue for the current year will not exceed £T. 150 million, thus leaving a deficit on the budget figures of over £T. 36 million.

5. This state of affairs has been brought about by a drop in indirect taxation, mainly as the result of the imposition of restrictions on imports, which have also had a repercussion on the yield of direct taxation.

6. To meet the deficit during the current financial year, the Turkish Government have been obliged, in order to restore the balance between expenditure and revenue—

(*a*) To obtain a contribution of £T. 2,440,000 from the funds of the Aviation League.

(*b*) To utilise the sum of £T. 15 million lying to the credit of the Turkish Government from the advance of 10 million dollars which was paid to the Treasury by the American–Turkish Investment Corporation against the grant of the Match Monopoly.

(*c*) To cut down departmental expenditure by £T. 15–20 million.

7. In this manner it is hoped that the deficit at the end of the current financial year will not represent a very large sum.

8. Whilst these measures will probably serve to meet the immediate difficulties of the Treasury during the present financial year, the Government have realised that further steps must be taken to balance public finances in 1932–33.

9. In drawing up preliminary budget estimates for the forthcoming financial year the Ministry of Finance calculated that, to cover expenditure, a sum of £T. 192 million would be required, whilst on the other hand revenue would not, on the present basis of taxation, yield more than £T. 148,500,000, thus leaving a deficit of £T. 43,500,000.

10. The People's party, to which the estimates were submitted, has, however, attained a nominal equilibrium in the following manner:—

A cut of £T. 20 million has been made in the estimates of expenditure, thus providing for a total of £T. 172 million.

These cuts will be effected—

(*a*) By a postponement until 1936 of the sums due to foreign armament manufacturers during the financial year 1932–33 (see Mr. Morgan's despatches O.T. (A) 5 and 8 of the 4th March and the 1st April respectively). This postponement, if agreed to, represents a reduction of £T. 11 million.

(*b*) By a scaling-down of departmental expenditure and by the curtailment of new constructional schemes, representing approximately £T. 9 million.

11. As regards revenue, the problem before the People's party was to find means of covering the difference between the reduced expenditure of £T. 172 million and the estimated yield of revenue of £T. 148,500,000.

12. It is proposed to meet this deficit by the following means:—

(1) A reduction of the list of raw materials which benefit from customs exemption.

(2) An increase in the transaction, property and transport taxes.

(3) The suppression of certain tax exemptions and franchises granted to national banks.
(4) The application of a new tax, to be known as the "Impôt d'Equilibre," which is to represent a 10 per cent. levy on all salaries of officials, employees, artisans, servants and workmen.

13. The yield of the new taxes is estimated to be approximately £T. 23,700,000 and the total estimates of revenue amount, therefore, to £T. 172,200,000, as against estimated expenditure of £T. 172 million.

14. Budget equilibrium, if achieved by these measures, will only have been attained by a suspension of payment to foreign bondholders, by a postponement of payment for armaments, by the imposition of a crushing burden of direct taxation on all classes of the population and by the cancellation of a number of privileges and exemptions, the existence of which was instrumental in inducing many Turkish and some foreign firms to establish industries in this country.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2033/33/34] No. 36.

Mr. Hoare to Sir John Simon.—(*Received April* 26.)

(No. 165. Secret.)
Sir, *Tehran, April* 5, 1932.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 91 of the 6th February last, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a despatch I have received from His Majesty's consul at Tabriz regarding the delimitation of the Persian-Turkish frontier.

2. The agreements recently concluded between the two countries passed their first reading in the Majlis on the 19th March.

3. I am forwarding copies of this despatch, without its enclosure, to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora (No. 38M), and His Majesty's consul at Tabriz (No. 8).

I have, &c.
R. H. HOARE.

Enclosure in No. 36.

Consul Palmer to Mr. Hoare.

(No. 17. Secret.)
Sir, *Tabriz, March* 16, 1932.

FRONTIER rectification and Trebizond route.

With further reference to paragraph 3 of my despatch No. 15, Secret, of the 3rd March, in which I ventured to suggest that Mr. Acting Consul Davis might with advantage visit Urumiah (in June) of this year, I now have the honour to report that the Turkish consul-general assured me yesterday that the commission for the final delimitation of the frontier will begin work in June—presumably starting on the Little Ararat section.

2. Probably, therefore, the commission will again make their headquarters at Bagchejik.

3. The two tracts to be ceded to Persia—one on the Salmas Province frontier and the other on the Urumiah Province frontier—would presumably be dealt with last.

4. Zia Bey, who reached Tehran on the second day of Tewfik Rushti Bey's pourparlers, told me that finally the Turkish Minister had been forced to say clearly that the Turks had no intention of evacuating the tract they already occupied, and that the Persians were told that they could "take or leave" the terms offered.

5. Zia added that the population along the Little Ararat section was pronouncedly anti-Turkish.

6. I gathered also from the Chief of Public Security that there were still a small number of Kurdish rebels hiding in the caves of the above district, but that

they could no longer cross into Turkey, and should not give so much trouble this year as last.

7. I met yesterday M. Salavioff—the Russian consul at Maku, who had been away when I visited Maku last November. He speaks a little English. He had little to say over the general aspects of the frontier rectification; but volunteered the statement that it would help the Turks to exploit the Trebizond route with comparative safety, and that he viewed this future Turkish competition with the Batum–Julfa route with alarm.

I gathered that Turkish transit charges were now only ¼ per cent.—but cannot be sure that I understood Salavioff's scraps of English.

8. Zia Bey is going to Stambul for two months shortly—going via Batum; but hoping to return via Trebizond. He said that in summer Trebizond to Tabriz could be done in five days!

I then pointed out that recent travellers had experienced great difficulties with the military. To this Zia replied that travellers had to be escorted through the military zone of Erzerum, and that in the case of Reitlinger his real nationality had been "considered doubtful," and he himself was inclined to consider him a naturalised German Jew! This despite his British passport. In any case Zia considered him "a suspicious character" and was "not surprised" that he had been sent to Kars, and, in all, had been forced to take thirteen days from Maku to Trebizond.

9. Zia Bey added that not very long ago the Persian consul—I think he said at Erzerum—was stopped while travelling to Russia and his baggage searched despite his diplomatic visa or passport. "He was found to be carrying a letter to Russia from his "Soviet colleague—which letter contained photographs of the Erzerum forts."

10. I repeat what Zia told me, without comment; but it would seem that travelling near the eastern Turkish frontier is not yet in the nature of a safe pleasure excursion—even when armed with a diplomatic visa.

11. Copy to His Majesty's Embassy, Stambul, and His Majesty's High Commission, Bagdad.

I have, &c.
STANHOPE PALMER.

[E 2234/847/44] No. 37.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 6.)

(No. 151.)
Sir, *Angora, April* 27, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 23rd April, 1932, the Kutahya–Balikesir branch of the Turkish State Railways was ceremoniously opened to traffic by Kasim Pasha, the President of the Grand National Assembly, who was accompanied by a suite of forty-seven persons composed of Deputies, railway officials and representatives of the press.

2. This line, which has been built by a German firm under contract with the Turkish Government, is 235 kilom. in length; the original intention was that it should be opened in May of last year, but owing to unforeseen difficulties which were encountered in the construction of one of the numerous tunnels, the opening ceremony was delayed for nearly a year.

3. The Constantinople newspaper "Cumhuriyet," in its issue of the 23rd April, states that the construction of the Samsun–Sivas section of the State Railways has now been completed, the two separate sections having been linked at Tirhal. The report adds that it is expected that the line will be officially opened to traffic on the 30th August next.

4. In the course of a speech declaring the Kutahya line open to traffic, Kasim Pasha stressed the military importance of the line, which ensured rapid communication between the centre of Anatolia and the Ægean. He stated that the total length of railways in Turkey was now 5,698 kilom., of which 3,430 kilom. had been constructed or purchased by the Government, and 2,268 kilom. belonged to private companies. The Government was gradually freeing itself from the heavy burden imposed on it by the terms of the railway concessions granted to foreign companies by the Ottoman Empire. Since the establishment of the Grand

National Assembly the Government had neither sought a foreign loan for railway construction, nor granted a railway concession to foreigners. By national sacrifices it had constructed 2,200 kilom. of railway in twelve years, and the work was continually going forward. He had just heard from the Ministry of Public Works that the Samsun–Sivas line and the Ankara–Sivas had now been joined up. He ended his speech by thanking the Gazi and Ismet Pasha for their foresight in inaugurating the policy of railway construction, and their unwavering constancy in pushing it on, despite all difficulties.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2235/1541/44] No. 38.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 6.)

(No. 152.)

Sir, *Constantinople, April* 24, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 142 of the 16th April, I have the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü Bey, and a large suite of Deputies, officials and journalists, arrived from Angora this morning, and embarked on the Soviet steamship "Gruzia" this afternoon, to pay the long-promised official visit to Moscow.

2. In the course of the morning the Prime Minister's "chef de cabinet" telephoned to say that his Excellency was anxious to see me at Dolma Bagche Palace, where he was awaiting the moment of departure. When I arrived there, Ismet Pasha said that he had taken advantage of his short stay in Istanbul to see me, because he wanted to know what I thought of Turkish policy as expounded by Tevfik Rüştü at Geneva, and what the effect had been on the Western Powers. I said that, as the King's Messenger unfortunately did not arrive until next Tuesday, I knew no more than anyone else who read the newspapers, but I had drawn the impression that the loyalty and sincerity of the foreign policy of Turkey, which, as his Excellency knew, I had always believed in, had been not only made manifest to the world at large, but had received general credence. I added that, in my humble opinion, the moment for Tevfik Rüştü's declaration had been admirably timed, especially if, as I gathered was the case, Turkey now really intended to become a member of the League of Nations. I purposely avoided saying "apply for membership," as I wished to get Ismet Pasha into the open on this point. His Excellency intimated that, while there was no longer any idea of Turkey only joining the League if she could do so as a permanent or semi-permanent member of the Council, she still wanted to be invited to join, either by the Council or by some of the Great Powers, and would also like to be sure in advance that she would have sufficient support to obtain a semi-permanent seat. This marks a certain advance on what the Turkish Ambassador in London said to Sir R. Vansittart on the 6th February, 1931, and I take it that the truth is that Turkey still wants to save face with the Soviet Republics. An invitation could be represented at Moscow as putting Turkey into a different class from an ordinary State "applying" for membership.

3. Ismet Pasha went on to say that he hoped it was appreciated that this juncture, just before the official visit to Moscow, had been deliberately chosen by the Turkish Government for letting their intentions as to the League of Nations be made public. In fact, his own view was that the declaration could not have been made at any other moment. The solemn assurance that Turkey had no secret treaties or alliances given before the world-forum of Geneva should, he felt, allay any anxiety among the Great Powers as to Turkey's relations with the Soviet Republics, while his official visit to Moscow, following immediately upon the declaration at Geneva, should convince the Soviets that Turkey's friendship for Russia was unabated.

4. On leaving the Prime Minister I found the Minister for Foreign Affairs waiting for me in the hall outside. I had been unable to see his Excellency on his return from Geneva, as he went straight through to Angora, and I had been detained at Istanbul, so that I was glad to have the opportunity to pay him my personal compliments on the way in which he had presented the Turkish ideas on disarmament. Tevfik Rüştü Bey appeared to be very pleased with his relations

with the foreign statesmen at Geneva, and not ill-content with the effect which he believed his words had had upon them, but although he talked for half an hour, his conversation on this subject followed the line taken by the Prime Minister, and it is unnecessary for me to report it at length.

5. I might add that, while his Excellency seemed to have some hope of the Disarmament Conference producing results which would at least mark a step in the advance, he was pessimistic about the general situation in Europe. His view, so far as I could understand him, was that a catastrophe was inevitable so long as economic remedies were prevented from being applied because of political considerations. Only if and when Europe realised that the general economic situation must be considered purely in economic terms would ruin be avoided, and he insisted that only a Great Power could drive this lesson home, and, of the Great Powers, only one—England. British experience and British impartiality and the example we had recently given to the whole world in facing our own problems alike not only made us the one Power qualified to save Europe, but the one Power that was recognised as such by all European States.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2243/318/44] No. 39.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 6.)

(No. 153.)

Sir, *Constantinople, April* 28, 1932.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 5 of the 21st instant, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. R. C. Owen-Wells, the British agent of the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, enclosing his report on the work done by that body from 1925 to its dissolution on the 19th April, 1932.

2. M. Hammerich has formally announced the closure of the tribunal to the Turkish Government, which has promised to reply very shortly, but until it does so I am holding up the approval of His Majesty's Government of the closing down of the tribunal, in accordance with the instructions in your telegram No. 11 of the 9th April.

3. Meanwhile, you will observe that Mr. Owen-Wells fully shares the doubts expressed by M. Hammerich as to the readiness of the Turkish Government to execute the judgments of the tribunal, and it seems clear that His Majesty's Embassy will be involved in a prolonged struggle with the Turkish Government on questions which, in order to be presented with full force, call for the expert assistance of someone familiar with their complicated nature. I therefore venture to press very earnestly that the suggestion of Mr. Owen-Wells, that His Majesty's Government should retain the services of M. Mavroudi from July next at the reduced salary of £300 a year, should be accepted.

4. I would also urge on your favourable consideration the proposal of Mr. Owen-Wells that the £620 18*s.* 5*d.*, representing the surplus of the "frais de consignation," and for which I enclose M. Hammerich's cheque herein, should be used to meet the expenses and fees of impecunious British claimants before the "bureau exécutif." I gather from Mr. Owen-Wells that there are about forty-five of these impecunious cases, and that an allowance of £T. 100 for each case should cover both the fees and the expenses of the Turkish barrister who will undertake the execution of the judgments, and it so happens that £T. 4,500 is, at the present exchange, just about £620. I might add that the total value of the awards in these cases is about £40,000.

5. Although the formal assent of His Majesty's Government to the final closure of the tribunal is not yet given, the work of that institution is practically ended, and I would therefore take this opportunity to place on record my sense of the impartiality and ability with which M. Hammerich has for six years carried out his very onerous and delicate duties. M. Hammerich was at times subjected to great pressure by the Turkish Government, and but for his firmness and strict sense of justice, His Majesty's Government might have had to meet judgments for very large sums The attitude of M. Hammerich was in no way swayed

by Anglophil sentiments, and his decisions were dictated solely by his view of what was the just and proper interpretation of the laws and treaties under which he was working, but weaker men might easily have given weaker decisions which would have involved a heavy charge on the British Exchequer. It would therefore, I venture to submit, be a graceful and certainly a much appreciated act if some recognition by His Majesty's Government of M. Hammerich's conduct of the tribunal were conveyed to him.

6. I would also venture to call your attention to the admirable work of Mr. Owen-Wells as British agent, an opinion which I am confident is shared by M. Hammerich and Judge Hill. The physical labour involved in preparing these cases was truly strenuous, and was invariably most efficiently carried out; but, apart from that, Mr. Owen-Wells showed great tact and ability in his dealings with the judges of the tribunal and with his Turkish colleague, and he was always most helpful in the various questions in which this Embassy was involved.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure 1 in No. 39.

Mr. Owen-Wells to Sir G. Clerk.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Constantinople, April* 21, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to submit herewith to your Excellency a report on the work done by the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal from the time of my appointment as British agent (1925) to the final dissolution of the tribunal (the 19th April, 1932), and I attach to it a complete list of the judgments delivered in favour of British subjects.

(1) Although Part IV of my report refers to the question of the execution of judgments, I respectfully submit to your Excellency this separate letter offering certain suggestions for dealing with this question.

I am loath to anticipate events or express any doubt as to the willingness of the Turkish Government to abide by the obligations it has assumed under the Treaty of Lausanne. I am, however, bound in duty to report that the Turkish Government itself and its representatives have shown up to the present reluctance to execute the judgments delivered by the tribunal in favour of British subjects; in fact, although all the requirements of the rather complicated procedure established to this effect have been accomplished by many of the successful British claimants, not a single judgment has yet been satisfied.

I may add in this respect, with the necessary reserve, that from persistent, although uncontrollable, reports reaching me from the Turkish circles of the tribunal, it appears that the Turkish Government have made up their mind to follow a policy of deliberate obstruction wherever the tribunal ordered the restitution to a British subject, of Greek or Armenian origin, of real property which has been seized under the Law of Abandoned Properties.

(2) While fully realising that the task of safeguarding the interests of those British subjects is outside my province, I venture to express the opinion that even if there is not any obstruction by the Turkish Government, there will be considerable difficulties to overcome from the fact that a great number of British claimants are impecunious and can ill afford to disburse the expenses and fees required for the execution of the judgments in their favour.

I therefore put before your Excellency the following suggestions, which seem to me likely to facilitate matters in this respect:—

(3) As these claimants are illiterate, considerable work will be required for (i) general correspondence; (ii) advising them on the procedure to be followed; (iii) the new powers of attorney to be obtained from them; (iv) translating the judgments and forwarding them to the Turkish barrister, who is to undertake the execution of the judgments. This work requires special knowledge of the procedure and also of each case, and I am justified in saying that these requirements are fully met by Mr. C. Mavroudi, who has been acting as my secretary during the last six years, and is therefore quite familiar with the work of the tribunal.

According to present arrangements, M. Mavroudi will carry on till the end of June next his work in my office for the final liquidation of the tribunal and its secretariat at his present salary of £600 a year.

I strongly recommend that the services of M. Mavroudi be retained by His Majesty's Government as from the 1st July next at a reduced salary of £300 a year with the object of carrying out the work in connexion with the execution of the judgments delivered by the tribunal.

(4) President Hammerich has handed over to me a cheque for £620 18*s.* 5*d.* which I enclose herewith, representing the surplus of the "frais de consignation."

I suggest that this sum might be used by your Excellency to meet the expenses and fees required before the "Bureau exécutif" in obtaining the execution of judgments delivered in favour of impecunious British claimants, and that a Turkish barrister be engaged to attend to this work either for a fixed sum or so much per case, and that M. Mavroudi would work in conjunction with him.

(5) If these proposals are adopted, the necessary work to carry out the conditions of the "Instruction administrative" of the Turkish Government on behalf of all successful claimants will be carried out as quickly as possible, and it will soon become evident as to whether or not it will be possible to obtain enforcement.

I have, &c.
R. C. OWEN-WELLS, *British Agent,*
Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

Enclosure 2 in No. 39.

Report of the British Agent on the Work of the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, 1925–32.

THE Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, after an activity of six years, was wound up on the 19th April, 1932.

On that date M. Hammerich, president of the tribunal, handed to His Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey and to the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs a *procès-verbal* stating that the tribunal had completed its work.

The secretariat of the tribunal will cease to function at the end of May, and is at present occupied on the work that is entailed in handing over the archives to the Turkish Government (article 96 of the Treaty of Lausanne).

The files of British claimants, which have passed through the hands of the British agent, will be deposited with the British Embassy at Constantinople, when my office will be definitely closed at the end of June.

The furniture, belonging exclusively to the British section, has been handed over to the British Embassy. The "quote-part" of the furniture belonging to His Majesty's Government, which was shared with the Italian and Turkish Governments, will be dealt with immediately after the closing of the secretariat of the tribunal.

On relinquishing the duties entrusted to me as British agent to the tribunal, I have the honour to submit this report, reviewing the work done and the results obtained:—

I.—*Constitution of the Tribunal.*

In 1925, on the proposal of the Board of Trade, I was appointed by the Foreign Office British agent to the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

On receiving the necessary instructions, I proceeded to Constantinople, where I arrived on the 20th April, 1925; I was joined there by Mr. H. D. K. Grimston, British member of the tribunal, and Mr. H. R. Dane, British secretary, and the president, M. Kai Hammerich, arrived shortly after.

It soon became evident that great difficulties, if not deliberate obstruction, had to be overcome. The Turkish Government were slow to nominate their representatives, and when, after many delays, this was done various other questions, such as the finding of suitable premises, the apportionment of rent and expenses, the drawing up of the rules of procedure, &c., caused interminable negotiations, which were rendered the more difficult and protracted as all the

various Governments concerned (British, Belgian, French, Greek, Italian, Roumanian and Turkish) had to be consulted.

2. It was clear from the beginning that the Turkish Government intended to lay great stress on a rigid interpretation of article 70 of the Treaty of Lausanne, which, if applied strictly, would have debarred all British claimants, relying on articles 65, 66 and 69 of the Treaty of Lausanne, from lodging their claims before the tribunal. A long period was spent in trying to arrange a compromise. M. Hammerich finally overcame the difficulty and induced the Turkish member to sign the rules of procedure by the application of article 95 (3) of the Treaty of Lausanne.

While these negotiations were in progress I was ordered by the Foreign Office and the Board of Trade to proceed to Paris to consult the British section of the Inter-Allied Commission for the Assessment of Damage suffered in Turkey, in order to ascertain if any of the claims lodged with that body should be transferred to the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal to be dealt with under articles 65, 66 and 69 of the Treaty of Lausanne.

My work there lasted three months, and, as a result, all the claimants for the restitution of real property were invited to transfer their claims to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

After the completion of this work I proceeded to London, where a conference was held at the Foreign Office on the 28th January, 1926, which was attended by representatives of the Foreign Office, the Board of Trade, President Hammerich, Mr. Grimston and myself, in order to discuss the difficulty which had arisen over article 70 of the Treaty of Lausanne. M. Hammerich explained the way he had overcome it, and the method was considered satisfactory.

3. I returned to Constantinople in March 1926, and the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal was officially constituted on the 19th April, 1926, with M. Hammerich as president, Mr. H. D. K. Grimston as British member and Djemil Bey as Turkish member.

The Turkish Government was represented by Emin Ali Bey, general agent to all the mixed tribunals.

During the life of the tribunal the following changes have taken place among its personnel :—

Soon after its constitution the Turkish member, Djemil Bey, was replaced by Memdouh Bey, but in April 1931 Djemil Bey was again reinstated.

Owing to an accident, the British member, Mr. H. D. K. Grimston, withdrew in the summer of 1928, and was replaced in November of the same year by Judge W. H. Hill, a former judge of the Native Court of Appeal of Cairo.

The British secretary, Mr. H. R. Dane, resigned his functions in October 1927, and it was then found that it was not necessary to replace him; consequently, since that date I have worked in the dual capacity of British agent and British secretary.

4. The seat chosen for the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, in common with all the other mixed tribunals, was at Tchemberli-Tache, Stamboul, in the building occupied formerly by the Ministry of Public Instruction.

It was arranged that all the general services (rent, heating, salaries of servants, furnishing of the audience room, &c.) should be borne half by the Turkish Government, the remaining half to be equally divided among the other six Governments concerned—British, Belgian, French, Greek, Italian and Roumanian. This arrangement lasted up to the year 1930, when the Italo-Turkish Tribunal completed its work and the Roumano-Turkish Tribunal was closed down by the withdrawal of the Roumanian Government, as a result of which the remaining four Governments have since had to bear these expenses.

In order to reduce expenditure, it had been previously arranged with the Italian and Turkish Governments that the Anglo-Turkish and Italo-Turkish Tribunals would have the same president and the same secretariat. Therefore up to the end of 1930 the expenses pertaining to the salaries of the president and the personnel of the secretariat, and also to the furnishing of the particular offices of these two tribunals, were shared in the proportion of one-half by the Turkish Government and the other half equally divided between His Majesty's Government and the Italian Government, but on the withdrawal of the Italian tribunal these expenses had to be shared by the British and Turkish Governments.

5. The president, M. Hammerich, decided that all claimants must deposit with the tribunal a certain sum in proportion to the importance of their claim, but not exceeding 250 Turkish liras, as "frais de consignation."

Impecunious claimants were relieved of this deposit.

Unsuccessful claimants have forfeited the whole or part of this deposit, and the sums thus obtained have been used to meet some expenses of the tribunal. The payment was also instituted to discourage claimants from lodging frivolous claims.

The British Government never had any control over this or took responsibility for it, as it was not provided for in the Treaty of Lausanne, and tacitly left it to M. Hammerich.

There is now a certain amount accumulated from the surplus "frais de consignation," which belongs to the tribunal, and which M. Hammerich has handed over to the two Governments in equal shares, amounting to £620 18*s.* 5*d.* for each Government.

II. *Activities of the Tribunal.*

6. Since the rules of procedure (article 17) allowed claims to be lodged in conformity with article 95 (3) of the Treaty of Lausanne within a period of six months from the constitution of the tribunal, circular letters were sent to all British subjects who had previously informed the secretariat of their intention of lodging claims, and warnings were sent out through the various official departments concerned or through the press informing interested parties that all claims before the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal should be lodged not later than the 19th October, 1926.

It was further agreed with President Hammerich, the Turkish member and the Turkish agent that, although the above time-limit of six months would be strictly adhered to as regards the formal notice of the claims, an additional three months, expiring on the 19th January, 1927, would be allowed for the actual lodging of the first written pleading. This period of three months was extended in some exceptional cases justified by *force majeure*.

7. On the 19th October, 1926, 558 claims had been lodged with the tribunal, of which 127 were against His Majesty's Government, 19 against British nationals, and the remaining 412 against the Turkish Government and Turkish nationals.

The tribunal held the first hearing on the 22nd February, 1927, and delivered its first judgment on the 8th March, 1927.

Out of the total 558 claims lodged with the tribunal, 325 claims have not been proceeded with for various reasons; some were struck off the lists because the claimants failed to lodge their memorials within the prescribed time-limits; some were withdrawn by the claimants themselves when adverse decisions were given on test cases; and some were settled by agreement.

In all these 325 cases, the tribunal delivered ordinances setting forth why the proceedings were abandoned.

The remaining 233 cases have been proceeded with up to the final stage and judgments have been given in all of them. Although all the judgments appear to be unanimous, as they are signed by all three arbitrators, it is within my knowledge that in many cases dissenting judgments have been put in. This is specially true in the Cypriot claims, which were all signed by the Turkish member with a reserve. In the great majority of these cases, the defendants raised the issue of competence of the tribunal, disputing the nationality of the claimants or alleging that the claim did not fall within the Treaty of Lausanne.

Therefore the tribunal had to decide first on the question of its competency, and when this issue was decided in favour of the claimants the written procedure had to be started *de novo* on the merits, and this took a great deal of time.

If these circumstances are taken into account, it will be seen that the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, in completing its work within six years from its constitution, has proceeded more speedily than the other mixed tribunals. With the exception of the Græco-Turkish Tribunal, which still has several thousand cases to dispose of, the Anglo-Turkish Tribunal had before it the greatest number of claims; and yet the Italo-Turkish Tribunal, which had only 64 cases, completed its work only at the end of 1930, while the Franco-Turkish

Tribunal, with 149 cases, is still in activity and cannot complete its work at least before the lapse of another year.

The results of the work done by the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, especially as regards British interests, may be summarised as follows :—

(A) *Claims against His Majesty's Government.*

8. The 127 claims lodged against His Majesty's Government by Turkish nationals involved, where the figures were mentioned in the statement of claims, an amount of £3,943,932 and £T. 393,461, and in this total is included the claim of the ex-Khedive, Abbas Hilmi Pasha, for £2,823,102.

In addition, there were many claims for the restitution of real property for which no exact value was given, for instance the claim of the heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid claiming vast properties in Iraq, Palestine, Cyprus, &c., the value of which is estimated at many million pounds. Furthermore, most of the claimants were claiming interest from the date of the alleged wrong done to them to the date at which the redress would have taken place. Therefore the total amount which His Majesty's Government would have had to pay to all these claimants, had they been successful, may be estimated at nearly £8 million.

His Majesty's Government has been successful in all these claims; the tribunal either declared itself incompetent or dismissed the claims.

Besides the claims of the ex-Khedive and the heirs of Abdul Hamid, there were some other large claims, like that of Reshid Sadi Bey, for properties or goods seized in England during the war. The great majority of the claims against His Majesty's Government were, however, lodged by Turkish nationals alleging that they had been wronged during the occupation of Constantinople by the Allies, either by way of properties requisitioned or by being deported to Malta. The damages claimed by the deportees to Malta amounted to several hundred thousand pounds.

Among the claimants against His Majesty's Government were two British nationals, Messrs. Lynch Brothers and Mrs. R. Templeton, for properties alleged to have been seized in Iraq and Palestine.

(B) *Claims against British Nationals.*

9. The nineteen claims against British nationals were lodged either by the Turkish Government itself or by Turkish nationals, and all of them dealt with disputes arising out of pre-war contracts. The total sums involved amounted to £345,715, £T. 513,751 gold, and 36,780 fr.

Among these claims figured those lodged by the Turkish Government against Messrs. Armstrong and Vickers for warships and ammunition seized during the war (His Majesty's Government being co-defendant), and also that of the Turkish Navigation Company, Seiri-Sefain, against various British shipyards, for non-execution of contracts on ships ordered.

All these claims failed except :—

(1) The Borax Mine of Sultan Tchair (Limited) (a British concern exploiting a mine in Turkey) has been ordered to pay to the Turkish Government £T. 5,805·54 plus interest amounting to £T. 307·60. This judgment has been already satisfied.

(2) Messrs. Hadfields (Limited) have been ordered either to execute a contract made before the war with the Turkish Government for guns and ammunition or to pay back to the Turkish Government the sum of £10,000 plus 5 per cent. interest from the 19th October, 1926, which they had received as payment in advance. I understand that negotiations are still proceeding between Messrs. Hadfields (Limited) and the Turkish Government in view of a compromise by way of a new contract.

(C) *Claims against the Turkish Government or Turkish Nationals.*

10. This category of claims have been lodged by British claimants either for execution of pre-war contracts, the payment of debts, or for the restitution of properties seized during the war.

Among the first figured the important claim of the bondholders of the Constantinople Municipal Loan 5 per cent. 1909.

The vast majority of these claims were, however, lodged by British nationals claiming the restitution of real property seized by the Turkish authorities during the war. In practically all these claims the Turkish Government disputed the British nationality of the claimants, and this necessitated double pleadings, as explained in paragraph 7.

Out of the total of 412 claims lodged by British nationals against the Turkish Government or Turkish nationals, 218 were withdrawn, settled out of court, or struck off the lists as being out of time, leaving a balance of 194 cases which have been proceeded with.

British claimants have been successful, totally or partially, in eighty cases, in which they obtained judgment in their favour.

The amounts involved in these judgments in favour of British claimants are £8,601 11*s.* 8*d.* and £T. 27,458 in cash plus interest, and about £125,000 estimated value of the properties to be restored.

11. From the date of the constitution of the tribunal the attitude of the Turkish personnel has been very courteous. This may be accounted for by the fact that at the period before the constitution of the tribunal the Mosul question was in an acute state and foreigners, and especially British, were none too popular in Turkey, but with the subsequent settlement of this problem the change in the attitude of the Turkish authorities towards us was very noticeable and gradually became quite cordial. My Turkish colleague, Emin Ali Bey, has shown the greatest courtesy towards me, and we have often succeeded by friendly negotiations in solving difficult questions, which otherwise might have created unpleasant incidents, as those which frequently occurred in the other Mixed Tribunals.

12. During the six years that the tribunal has functioned, and out of a total of 558 cases disposed of, I recollect only three instances when any serious difficulty arose with the Turkish Government :—

(1) In the claim of the bondholders of the Constantinople Municipal Loan 5 per cent. 1909, although in an interlocutory judgment the tribunal declared itself competent and ordered the continuance of the procedure on the merits, the Turkish defendants, namely, the Municipality of Constantinople and the Turkish Ministry of Finance, refused to accept this judgment and abstained from any further proceedings. In fact the Turkish member of the tribunal threatened to resign. This incident did not, however, have any consequences, as in the meantime the bondholders reached an amicable settlement of the dispute by private negotiations with the Municipality of Constantinople.

(2) In the claim of the heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was rumoured that both the Turkish member and the Turkish agent intended to withdraw from the sitting at which the adverse judgment was to be pronounced. Nothing happened, however, and although the claimants, supported by the Turkish Government, have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no official step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(3) In a claim for the restitution of real property lodged against the Turkish Government by Mrs. Virginie Kalpakdjian, widow of a British claimant of Persian origin, who had acquired British nationality by naturalisation, the Turkish Government refused to accept the interlocutory judgment of the tribunal which found that the claimant's husband was originally a Persian subject and that his British naturalisation was in order. The Turkish Government persisted in its allegation that the claimant's husband was still considered as a Turkish subject and refused to plead on the merits of the case. Consequently judgment for the return of a considerable amount of property was delivered by default.

III.—*Jurisprudence established by the Tribunal.*

13. The tribunal, in examining the various cases brought before it, had to decide on many interesting questions of principle arising out of the interpretation of the Treaty of Lausanne, some of which have even a wider interest in international law.

I give a summary of the most interesting decisions :—
It has been held that—

(*a*) Article 58 of the Treaty of Lausanne excludes all pecuniary claims for loss or damage suffered as a result of acts of war. Therefore the provisions of article 65 apply to the restitution "en nature" of properties which still exist and can be identified. Any claim for the payment of the value of property which does not exist any more has been dismissed. This also applied to liquid money, letters of credit, or credits in banks, unless it can be proved that the actual bank-notes or coins, which have been deposited, are still in existence and can be identified. (No. 64, Eastern Bank (Limited) *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*b*) The provisions of article 66 were interpreted in the same sense as those of article 65; consequently the provisions dealing with the liquidation of properties seized are operative only when these properties still exist and can be identified. Article 66 gives an option to the defendants either to restore the property or pay to the claimants the product of the liquidation, but the tribunal has no right to compel the defendants to pay the value of the property if they choose to restore it in its existing state. (No. 2, Reshid Saadi Bey *v.* the British Government.)

(*c*) The last paragraph of article 137 does not apply to claims against the Powers who had occupied Constantinople or their authorities. Otherwise there would be a contradiction with the first paragraph of the same article, which excludes all such claims. (No. 356, Ahmed Emin Bey *v.* the British Government.)

(*d*) The term "acts of war" within the meaning of article 58 covers all acts arising out of the war, including personal internment and deportation, which took place from the 1st August, 1914, to the coming into force of the Treaty of Lausanne. Consequently all measures taken during the armistice fall under the provisions of article 58. (No. 356, Ahmed Emin Bey *v.* the British Government.)

(*e*) Article 25 of the treaty, by which Turkey recognises the full force of the treaties of peace concluded between the Allies and the Powers who fought on the side of Turkey, has a bearing on political and territorial questions only, but does not imply that the provisions of those other treaties are applicable to Turkey in the matter of reparations or requisitions, which are governed exclusively by articles 58, 65 and 66 of the Treaty of Lausanne. (No. 64, Eastern Bank (Limited) *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*f*) Article 70 (see paragraph 2 above) has been interpreted in the sense that the obligation for claimants to lodge their claims with the competent authorities was purely formal; that in mentioning an eventual agreement with the competent authorities this clause presupposes the institution of a special board or commission to examine these claims, but such a board or commission was not set up in any country; that in these circumstances the claimants did not know which authorities were responsible for the measures taken during the war in respect of their properties; furthermore, the constitutional and administrative changes which took place in Turkey at the time of the coming into force of the Treaty of Lausanne still increased this embarrassment of the claimants; on the other hand, article 70 does not provide any penalty for the failure to comply with its prescriptions, and therefore the tribunal has a right to use its discretion in conformity with the provisions of article 95 (3) and admit all claims which could not be lodged within twelve months from the coming into force of the Treaty of Lausanne for the reason that the tribunal was not constituted till a later date. (No. 62, David Sassoon and Co. (Limited) *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*g*) By application of the provisions of article 78, all disputes arising out of pre-war contracts, including debts, fell under the jurisdiction of the tribunal. This includes not only those contracts which remained in force (article 73), but also those annulled (article 75), inasmuch as the object of the dispute arises out of obligations previous to the date when the parties became enemies. (No. 213, Alfred H. Midwood and Co. (Limited) *v.* Cleanthes Hadjopoulos.)

(*h*) A Turkish province (vilayet) is a juridical person separate from the Central Government; the latter cannot be sued for disputes arising out of contracts passed with the vilayets. (No. 71, Ransomes, Sims and Jefferies (Limited) *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*i*) An expropriation carried out by the Government or the municipal authorities for reasons of public utility cannot be considered to be an exceptional war measure; the tribunal had to examine each expropriation separately in order

to ascertain whether it was a *bona fide* one and whether it was or might have been applied indiscriminately to Turkish nationals as well as to foreigners. (No. 89, John George Pisani *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*j*) The Turkish Government cannot be held responsible for the restitution of properties situated within territories detached from Turkey. (No. 50, Pauline Dweck *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*k*) The tribunal is incompetent to examine disputes arising out of contracts concluded after the 30th October, 1918, as these are governed by ordinary law in accordance with the provisions of article 77. (No. 3, Mayer Hersh Sirtsky *v.* the British Government.)

(*l*) The provisions of article 73 (*f*) apply only to ordinary contracts concluded by the State and which are governed by civil law; the relations between a State and its officials fall under public (administrative) law. (No. 84, Nouh Fehde *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*m*) The provisions of article 73 are subject "to the stipulations of the present treaty" and "cannot be invoked in order to give to contracts a validity different from that which they had in themselves when they were concluded"; these restrictions, together with the provisions of article 75, lead to the conclusion that the execution of a contract falling under article 73 cannot be enforced if reasons of *force majeure* prevented it; consequently, if ammunition of war ordered before the war and already manufactured has been requisitioned during the war by the British Government, the British contractors cannot be held responsible for it nor can they be bound to manufacture again that ammunition owing to changed conditions. The British Government is exonerated by virtue of article 58. (No. 389, the Turkish Government *v.* Vickers (Limited) and the British Government.)

(*n*) The British Royal decree by which the war ammunition ordered by the Turkish Government in England before the war was requisitioned by the British Government during the war mentioned not only the ammunition itself, but also the interests of the Turkish Government and sums of money received on account of the price to be paid; consequently the Turkish Government cannot claim the restitution of the sums paid in advance to the contractors. (No. 384, the Turkish Government *v.* Sir W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth and Co. (Limited).)

(*o*) All disputes arising out of contracts fall under the articles contained in section II, Part III, of the Treaty of Lausanne (contracts and prescriptions). Therefore a claimant is not entitled to rely on article 65 (rights and interests) in order to claim the enforcement of the rights he possessed under a contract. (No. 108, Miss Dermina Whittall *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*p*) In conformity with article 84, money deposited as guarantee shall be restored "in the currency agreed upon at the rate current in its country of origin." Consequently a claimant who deposited with the Turkish Government Turkish gold liras cannot claim payment in gold, but only in Turkish paper liras, which are the currency legally accepted in Turkey. (No. 84, Richard La Fontaine *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*q*) The Turkish law on abandoned properties is an exceptional war measure. Therefore properties of British nationals seized under this law fall within article 65 of the Treaty of Lausanne. (No. 513, Mihran Ekmekdjian *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*r*) Cyprus was a British Protectorate by virtue of the treaty of the 4th June, 1878, and its practical application for forty years. Consequently persons who were resident in Cyprus before the war must be considered as being under British protection within the meaning of article 64 of the Treaty of Lausanne. Some eighty claims have been won on the issue of competency by virtue of this decision. (No. 309, P. M. and B. M. Parounakian *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*s*) A person who was originally a Turkish national and acquired British nationality by naturalisation before the war cannot sue the Turkish Government before the mixed tribunal, for the reason that his certificate of naturalisation contains a restrictive clause to the effect that he is not entitled to British protection within the limits of his country of origin. (No. 66, Christine B. Agopian *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*t*) A person who before the war was an Allied national (Greek, French, &c.), but who acquired British nationality by naturalisation during the war, was entitled to lodge a claim with the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, provided he was a British national at the date of the coming into force of the

Treaty of Lausanne. (No. 52, Paléologue Chryssomallos *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*u*) A Greek national who enjoyed British protection by reason of his functions of British consul could not lodge a claim with the Anglo-Turkish Tribunal; he comes under the jurisdiction of the Græco-Turkish Tribunal. If, however, that person was a Turkish national or had the nationality of a country other than the Allied countries participating in the constitution of the mixed tribunals under the Treaty of Lausanne, he would be entitled to apply for redress before the Anglo-Turkish Tribunal in his quality of British protected person. (No. 168, John X. Alexakis *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*v*) The jurisdiction of the tribunal is strictly limited to claims in which one party is British and the other Turkish. Therefore the tribunal is incompetent to examine any claim lodged by a British (or Turkish) national against his own Government. (No. 73, Lynch Brothers (Limited) *v.* the Turkish Government and the British Government.)

(*w*) The jurisdiction of the tribunal is strictly limited to measures which have taken place during the war between the 1st August, 1914, and the date of the coming into force of the Treaty of Lausanne. Therefore all acts or measures which have taken place before or after that period are outside the competence of the tribunal. (No. 8, Heirs of the late Sultan Abdul Hamid *v.* the British Government.)

IV.—*Execution of Judgments.*

14. As stated above (paragraph 10), there are altogether eighty judgments in favour of British nationals. Out of these judgments, one defendant has willingly executed his obligations. Consequently there remain at the present time seventy-nine judgments to be executed, of which seventy-two against the Turkish Government, one against a State-owned company (the Seiri-Sefaine), and six against Turkish subjects.

The procedure to be followed for the execution of these judgments has been set forth in the Turkish law No. 1633 of the 26th May, 1930, and in the "instructions administratives" issued by the Turkish Government.

The successful claimant must, either himself in person or through a representative appointed by a special power of attorney, submit a petition to the Turkish agent with certified copy and translation in Turkish of the judgment. The Turkish agent sends the dossier to Angora, and the Turkish Government forward it to the Executive Bureau of Istanbul for execution.

15. This procedure offers some disadvantages from the claimants' point of view. The fact that the judgments will be sent to the Executive Bureau by the Turkish Government indicates that the latter reserve to themselves the right to scrutinise the judgments and to execute only those they consider in conformity with the Treaty of Lausanne. In Turkey, judgments against the Government cannot be enforced; the Executive Bureau simply delivers an ordinance enjoining the Department concerned to execute the judgment, but if the judgment is not executed no further action can be taken. The condition that a Turkish barrister must be employed by the claimants before the Executive Bureau will greatly add to their difficulties, as most of these claimants are impecunious.

Considerable correspondence has passed on this matter between His Majesty's Embassy in Turkey and myself, and finally it was decided that, when in England last year, a conference should be held with the various Departments concerned in order to decide on the course to be followed, and this was held at the Board of Trade on the 30th April, 1931. Representatives of the Foreign Office, the Treasury Solicitor and the Board of Trade attended.

It was decided that a request should be sent by the Foreign Office to His Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey to approach unofficially the Turkish Government, in order to have the procedure simplified, at least in those cases where the Turkish Government itself was the defendant.

After a long delay the reply of the Turkish Government was received, declining politely any modification to the procedure and informing the Embassy that several judgments had already been sent to the Executive Bureau for execution. (None, in fact, have yet been executed.)

In these circumstances, nothing else could be done but wait and see how the procedure would be applied in practice.

16. In the meantime, I have sent to all successful claimants copies of the law and of the "instruction administrative," and invited them to appoint a local representative in order to press for the execution of the judgments in their favour; I explained to those claimants, for whom I was acting heretofore as mandatory before the tribunal, that I could not continue to represent them for the execution of the judgments, because the appointment of a member of the Turkish Bar was necessary, and also for the reason that I should leave Turkey as soon as the tribunal was wound up, and my office would be closed.

Many of these claimants have appointed local representatives. I anticipate, however, some difficulties in this matter, as most of them cannot afford to pay the required fees, which, with expenses, would amount to about £15 for an ordinary claim.

A way out of this difficulty might be to appoint a local Turkish barrister, who, for a lump sum, would undertake the execution of all judgments in favour of impecunious claimants, his fees and expenses being met out of the sum of £620 18*s.* 5*d.* which has been handed over by the president as surplus of "frais de consignation" (paragraph 5). This barrister would work in connexion with some person appointed by His Majesty's Embassy.

17. I have already referred (paragraph 12) to the possibility of the Turkish Government applying for a revision of the judgments delivered in two cases; namely, the claim of the heirs of the late Sultan Abdul Hamid *v.* the British Government, and of Mme. Virginie N. Kalpakdjian *v.* the Turkish Government. Article 55 of the rules of procedure provides that petitions for revision may be presented within two years after the notification of the judgments, if justified by the discovery of a new fact.

In my opinion, if the Turkish Government accept without any reserve the protocol relative to the closing down of the tribunal, this must be construed as meaning that they waive any claim to further proceedings before it.

V.—*Conclusion.*

18. It will be seen from the above review of the work done by the tribunal that, on the whole, the results are very satisfactory from the British point of view: His Majesty's Government have successfully defended all the claims lodged against them; all the other British defendants, except two, have been also successful; and eighty British claimants have succeeded in their claims against the Turkish Government or Turkish nationals.

Apart from this practical result, I think the tribunal has also accomplished an ulterior object; namely, to avoid direct and embarrassing discussions with the Turkish Government on difficult and complicated disputes likely to cause friction at a time when the ill feeling caused by the war was still acute, and thus to facilitate the gradual improvement of relations between the two countries.

19. My task as representative of His Majesty's Government before the tribunal has been greatly facilitated by the kind support I have always found in the various Government Departments; such as the Foreign Office, the Board of Trade and the Treasury Solicitor.

My special thanks are due to his Excellency His Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey and all the staff of the Embassy for the constant and kind help they have extended to me during these seven years; thanks to their support and sympathetic help, many difficult and delicate matters have been settled satisfactorily.

20. President Kai Hammerich, while always maintaining a strict impartiality and equity befitting a neutral president of an arbitral tribunal, has displayed great ability in casting the deciding vote on many complicated juridical issues involving questions of international law, and has shown great tact in handling many difficult matters during the organisation and the life of the tribunal. It is thanks to him that, on many occasions when the Turkish Government showed signs of reluctance in carrying out their obligations under the Treaty of Lausanne, a satisfactory solution has been found.

21. Mr. Judge W. H. Hill, British member of the tribunal, has, during his connexion with the tribunal, gained the esteem and respect of all persons who came in touch with him. It is in a great measure due to him that the work of the tribunal has been accelerated and completed within a comparatively short period.

22. In conclusion I would like to place on record my thanks to my staff,

which at one time consisted of six, many of whom have been with me for more than three years.

In particular, I would like to thank Mr. C. Mavroudi, my secretary, who has been of the very greatest assistance to me, and to whom I am much indebted, especially in regard to the Cypriot pleadings, the success of which was in a large measure due to him.

R. C. OWEN-WELLS,
British Agent,
Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

[E 2236/449/44] No. 40.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 6.)

(No. 154.)

Sir, *Constantinople, April* 28, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 152 of the 24th instant relative to the visit of Ismet Pasha to Russia, I have been informed that when he and his suite, including Mmes. Ismet and Tevfik Rüştü, left Angora for Constantinople on the 23rd instant, he was accompanied to the station by the President of the Republic, and it was noticeable that the applause of the waiting crowd for Ismet Pasha was heartier and more spontaneous than that given to the Gazi.

2. The party is expected to return to Turkey about the 10th May, by which time the large Turkish delegation will no doubt have been suitably impressed by the warmth of the welcome awaiting them and of the sincerity of Russia's feelings towards Turkey.

3. The Anatolian agency and the Turkish press lay emphasis on the friendship and help which Russia has consistently given to Turkey since the early dark days of Turkey's fight for independence, and on the harmony of aims and interests uniting the two countries. They point out that, although it is the first time in history that a Turkish Prime Minister pays a visit to Russia, the visit should not cause anxiety to Eastern or Western Governments, and insist that Turkey is able to maintain cordial relations with Russia while maintaining equally cordial relations with Western nations.

4. The visit, as stated in my despatch No. 358 of the 1st November, 1931, was arranged during M. Litvinoff's stay in Angora at the end of October 1931, and it is already announced that it is expected that M. Molotov will return the visit at some future date. The exchange of visits between the two countries, which seems to be becoming a fixed and periodic institution, bears witness to the friendly relationship prevailing between the two countries without having on any one occasion any particular significance.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's representative at Moscow.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2271/449/44] No. 41.

Mr. Strang to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 8.)

(No. 69.)

(Telegraphic.) R. *Moscow, May* 8, 1932.

OFFICIAL communiqué was published this morning reviewing results of Ismet Pasha's visit.

Visit has, it states, shown that policy of close collaboration in the past has been fully justified, and that both world situation and interests of parties require that such collaboration should be further developed.

Similarity of economic and cultural problems facing the two countries is conducive to more effective contact, and an agreement of principle has been reached on steps to be taken for this purpose. With this object Soviet Government "have opened a long-term credit to amount of 8 million dollars to be repaid in kind by yearly instalments, for acquisition of latest type of machinery of Soviet manufacture."

[E 2381/449/44] No. 42.

Mr. Strang to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 17.)

(No. 231.)

Sir, *Moscow, May* 3, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü Bey, accompanied by their wives and a large party of other Turkish notables, arrived at Odessa on the morning of the 26th April on an official visit to the Soviet Union. The party included, in addition to the persons enumerated in Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 142 of the 16th April, Ismet Pasha's brother and nephew, Hayri Bey and Hasan Bey, and also Hüsrev Bey, described as attached to the Presidency of the Council, and Kazim Pasha, former commander of the 8th Division. The party was accompanied by M. Surits, Soviet Ambassador at Angora, and was met at Odessa by Hüseyin Ragip Bey, Turkish Ambassador at Moscow, and a number of Soviet officials. The Soviet steamer "Gruziya," with the visitors on board, was escorted into port by the cruiser "Profintern," which fired a salute of twenty-one guns. Ismet Pasha inspected the guard of honour and greeted them in Russian. The party were entertained to a banquet, visited factories and other institutions, were taken to the ballet, and left for Moscow, via Kiev, by special train at midnight.

2. In his speech of welcome at the banquet, the president of the Odessa District Executive Committee, recalled the victorious resistance of both countries to foreign intervention and their common work in the cause of peace. In his reply Ismet Pasha thanked his hosts for the hearty reception he had received as the representative of "national and revolutionary Turkey." Soviet-Turkish friendship, of which he brought a new assurance in the name of Turkey and the Gazi, was the expression of the sincere desire of the two peoples. It was the fruit of common interests and of the logic of events, and it replaced the misunderstanding of two régimes that had passed away.

3. The visitors were met on arrival in Moscow on the morning of the 28th April by M. Molotov, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, M. Litvinov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, who had come back from Geneva for the purpose, and other prominent civil and military officials. The Italian and Persian Ambassadors alone of the foreign representatives in Moscow were present at the station. The two Ministers were accommodated in the official house of reception of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, the remainder in hotels. In the course of the day, Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü Bey paid visits to M. Kalinin, president of the Central Executive Committee, and to M. Molotov and M. Litvinov, and laid a wreath on Lenin's tomb in the mausoleum in the Red Square. Groups of the Turkish party visited the Commissariats of Heavy Industry, Light Industry, Supply, Foreign Trade, Agriculture, Education, and Health.

4. On the evening of the 28th April M. Molotov gave a banquet for the Turkish visitors, which was attended by the chief Soviet notables. The dinner was followed by a reception, to which the staffs of foreign missions and their wives, foreign press correspondents, and numbers of Soviet officials were invited. The men wore lounge suits, the women evening dress. The reception was, on this occasion for the first time, held in the Kremlin palace itself, in the Hall of St. George, a great hall of white marble reached by a long, straight staircase, on the upper landing of which still hangs a large picture of Alexander III and his court. The names and arms of the Knights of St. George are graven on the stone panels and pillars of the hall. The reception was a rather dreary affair. The hall was much too big for the 500 or so people invited. A good many of the guests arrived before the hosts had finished dinner, and M. Molotov, who lacks the heartiness of his predecessor, M. Rykov, made little attempt to establish contact with his guests other than the Turks. Many more Soviet officials than usual were invited, but except for the few (whether Commissars, Foreign Commissariat officials or theatrical managers) who are accustomed to meet foreigners, they kept to themselves, either walking round and round the hall, as they are accustomed to do in the foyers of the theatres, or congregating in groups in corners of the hall. There was a little dancing. Supper was served in the adjoining Hall of St. Andrew, a larger and more exotic version of the Locarno room at the Foreign Office, decorated in red and white and gold. The

supper was of the stock Moscow type, plentiful and well presented, but, apart from the caviare, not very appetising.

5. The speeches delivered by M. Molotov and Ismet Pasha at the banquet were of no special note. Molotov stressed the importance of the occasion, the establishment of personal contact with the Prime Minister of a friendly country accompanied by a large and representative delegation. Soviet-Turkish friendship was of historic importance, established at a time when both countries were struggling for independent existence against the forces of imperialism, and now tested and confirmed by twelve years' experience, and fortified by repeated personal contacts between the political leaders. The Soviet-Turkish Treaty of 1925 was a political agreement of a new type, a pact of neutrality and non-aggression, which had already served, and would serve again, as a model for others. Notwithstanding the differences in the social and economic systems of the two countries, economic relations would continue to be strengthened. The exchange of views made possible by the present visit was of special importance for the cause of peace, falling as it did at a moment when influences hostile to peace were playing an increasingly powerful part in the world. He concluded with compliments and toasts.

6. In his reply Ismet Pasha said that he was touched by the warmth of his welcome, and would never forget the precious tokens of friendship he had received on the hospitable soil of a great and friendly nation. He was glad to be able by personal contact to enter into relations with Soviet leaders and to see the Soviet economic achievements for himself. For the rest, he did little more than associate himself with M. Molotov's remarks on the character and significance of Soviet-Turkish friendship, but he made no reference to that bogey of the Soviet mind, the imminent threat of a new imperialist war. Translations of the two speeches are enclosed in my immediately following despatch.

7. Earlier in the day Ismet Pasha gave an interview to a representative of the Tass Agency, in the course of which, in reply to a question as to future developments in Turkey, he emphasised that Turkey was a land of peasants, and that future policy would be based on the hopes and needs of the peasantry. This may have been disappointing to the questioner, for in Soviet Russia, although it is a peasant country, the emphasis is laid on industrialisation, and the peasants are exploited for the benefit of the urban workers.

8. On the 29th April M. Kalinin entertained Ismet Pasha and others of the party at luncheon to meet Stalin. They subsequently paid an official call on the President and Presidium of the Moscow Soviet, and visited motor-car and ball-bearing works in the neighbourhood of Moscow.

9. In the evening M. Litvinov gave a dinner in honour of the Turkish visitors. The heads of foreign missions and their wives were invited, though the press notices of the function exclude all reference to this fact. The host was nearly half an hour, and some of the guests as much as an hour, late. Dinner jackets were worn. I found myself seated between Yunus Nadi Bey, editor of the "Cumuriet," and Ruşen Eşref Bey, secretary of the Assembly. Yunus Nadi Bey had had a heavy day and was rather incoherent. On having the Japanese Ambassador pointed out to him, he made some venomous remarks about the Japanese, and said that if there was war between Japan and Russia, Turkey would break off relations with Japan, or, rather, this is what he would advocate in his newspaper when he returned to Angora. It would be much more useful than anything the League of Nations had done, and would have a tremendous moral effect. Rather inconsequentially he added: "We have given our word." At this point Ruşen Eşref Bey, with apologies for his condition, shut him up. I cannot judge whether his remarks are likely to have any significance.

10. M. Litvinov's dinner was followed by a gala performance at the Opera —one act of "Prince Igor," one act of "Sadko," and one act of the ballet "Don Quixote." M. Molotov appeared at the opening of the second act, and he and Ismet Pasha drew the cheers of the house by standing for a few moments hand in hand. Some of the party attended a reception given by the "Izvestiya" after the performance.

11. On the 30th April, the visitors lunched with Voroshilov, Commissar for War and Marine, together with members of the Revolutionary Military Council and leading military personalities. In the course of his reply to Voroshilov's speech of welcome, Ismet Pasha said: "As an old soldier I know that, however far military technique may advance, the essential element in war

is the man. The Soviet and Turkish people are inspired by the great ideals of revolution and peace, and are, therefore, unconquerable. I am firmly convinced that if it should come to a military conflict, the Red Army would be victorious." In the evening there was a Soviet-Turkish dinner at the Turkish Embassy, followed by a reception for the staffs of foreign missions and others. This was, I believe, M. Molotov's first appearance at a foreign Embassy.

12. The whole Turkish delegation witnessed the May Day parade in the Red Square from a special stand, and, unlike the rest of us, remained for the civil demonstrations which followed the parade. They must have been on their feet for nearly five hours. Later in the day Ismet Pasha attended a reception organised by the All-Union Chamber of Commerce. He told the company that he rejoiced to see the successes achieved by the Soviet Union in the economic and cultural field, and that he could also, for his part, give an account of Turkish achievements which, in spite of differences of scale, would equally rejoice his hearers. Soviet-Turkish relations should be developed in the cultural, technical and commercial as well as the political sphere. It could not, however, be denied that here there might sometimes be insurmountable difficulties, though not necessarily serious ones. Turkey desired to utilise Soviet achievements in the development of Turkish national economy. Soviet industry had already learnt to produce excellent goods, which Turkey would prefer to take from Soviet Russia than buy abroad. There was no reason why commercial relations should not be successfully developed.

13. A reception was given by the Tass Agency for the Turkish journalists and men of letters accompanying the delegation. Yunus Nadi Bey and Ruşen Eşref Bey spoke. They were both, as they were intended to be, powerfully impressed by the parade and demonstrations they had just witnessed.

14. On the evening of the 1st May the Italian Ambassador gave a dinner for the chief Soviet and Turkish personalities, followed by a reception attended by heads of foreign missions. The Ambassador told me that his reason for giving this entertainment was that Ismet Pasha was shortly to visit Rome. Some people think it an unnecessarily pointed demonstration of Soviet-Turkish-Italian solidarity.

15. On the following day the Turkish party witnessed a gymnastic display followed by a football match in the Stadium of the Dinamo (G.P.U.) Sporting Club. In the evening they were taken to the ballet. On the evening of the 3rd May they left for Leningrad.

16. Tevfik Rüştü told me that the visit was simply one of friendship. In these troubled times it was valuable to exchange views at first hand on problems of the day, and this was what they were doing. The German Ambassador tells me that M. Krestinsky spoke to him to similar effect a week or two ago. I had a short talk with Ismet Pasha, who seemed at that particular moment to be more interested in the Far Eastern situation than in anything else.

17. Tevfik Rüştü was rather less talkative than when he was here in 1930. Ismet Pasha carried through his rather trying ordeal with dignified courtesy. Mme. Ismet was unfortunately ill for a good part of the visit. The licensed gossip of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs told me that of the Turkish party they liked Tevfik Rüştü and the Ambassador best, as being people with whom it was possible to talk. They found Ismet rather unresponsive and rustically minded ("il est trop berger"), and I suppose not sufficiently impressed with their new world.

18. As may be gathered from the above, the Soviet Government have spared no pains to do honour to their guests. The Russians, I should imagine, attach more importance to the relations between the two countries than do the Turks. For Turkey, Russia is a make-weight; for Russia, Turkey is an only friend. If Turkey were about to become a member of the League of Nations, it would be natural that she should make a reassuring demonstration of amity to her friend in the other camp. Russia, for her part, is in real or imagined danger of an attack upon her rights and interests in Manchuria, or even upon her territorial integrity in the Far East, and is suffering from a more than usually violent attack of nerves as to the danger of an attack from the West. The value of Turkey to her in this situation is that of the one Power who, geographically and racially, and by the very character of her political relations with other countries, can be confidently counted on neither to engage in nor to become involved by force of circumstances, in anti-Soviet political or economic combinations.

19. The Soviet view of the visit was stated in a leading article in the official "Izvestiya" on the 28th April, a translation of which is enclosed in my immediately following despatch. The visit of Ismet Pasha differs, apparently, from the ordinary run of visits among imperialist statesmen, in that while the latter are but stages on the road to the preparation of a new world war and an attack on the Soviet Union, it represents a stage in the struggle for peace. After drawing the parallel between the early history of the two régimes and recalling their mutual aid in their fight for independence against the imperialists in the early days of their existence, the article goes on to say that the Soviet Union and an independent nationalist Turkey are each in their own way obstacles to the fulfilment of imperialist plans. The imperialist States have, therefore, formed groups of a military character, the object of which is to destroy not only the Soviet Union, but the nationally independent States of the East. They are sparing no pains, but in vain, to break the connexion between the proletarian revolution in Europe and the nationalist movement in the East, of which Soviet-Turkish friendship is a symbol. The result of Ismet Pasha's visit will be to strengthen that friendship and serve the cause of peace.

20. I have sent a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora.

I have, &c.
WILLIAM STRANG.

[E 2383/449/44] No. 43.

Sir E. Ovey to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 17.)

(No. 241.)

Sir, *Moscow, May* 9, 1932.

WITH reference to Mr. Strang's despatch No. 231 of the 3rd May I have the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and his party returned to Moscow from Leningrad on the 6th May and left Moscow on the night of the 7th May for Sebastopol, where they embarked for Stamboul. M. Molotov went to the station to see them off and M. Litvinov and members of his staff accompanied them to Sebastopol.

2. I enclose a note by Mr. Bullard on proceedings at Leningrad.

3. The results of Ismet Pasha's visit were, as reported in my telegram No. 69 of the 8th May, reviewed in an official statement published here on the 8th May. This statement was as follows:—

"During his stay in the U.S.S.R. the President of the Council of Ministers of the Turkish Republic, Ismet Pasha, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Tevfik Rüştü Bey, who accompanied him, had repeated conversations with all the responsible leaders of the Soviet Government. The respective Ambassadors were present at the meetings.

"These conversations were of an extremely cordial and friendly character, and permitted extensive consideration, not only of the international problems of interest to the two countries, but also of questions relating to their direct relations with each other. Complete community of view was established, permitting it to be agreed that the policy of close collaboration between the two countries in the past had fully justified itself, and that the general international situation and the interests of world peace made it necessary not merely to maintain but to extend that collaboration.

"Special attention was paid to the problems of the economic and cultural connexions between Turkey and the U.S.S.R. The personal acquaintance of the Turkish visitors with the economic construction now proceeding in the U.S.S.R., and with the work of Soviet science, revealed in many cases a great similarity in the problems facing both countries in these spheres, and the practical possibility of a much more extensive and more effective contact.

"An agreement in principle was reached as to the steps to be taken to effect this practical contact, and with this object the Soviet Government has opened a long-term credit to the amount of 8 million dollars, to be repaid in kind by yearly instalments, for the acquisition of the latest types of equipment of Soviet manufacture.

"It was also agreed that it would be useful to strengthen the cultural connexion between the two countries, in particular, by a more vital and direct connexion between the scientific institutes of the two countries."

4. The eventual possibility of some such business agreement had been foreshadowed at the time of M. Litvinov's visit to Angora last October, when the "Izvestiya," as reported in Mr. Strang's despatch No. 554 of the 23rd October, 1931, spoke of the time, now approaching, when the Soviet Union would be strong enough industrially to afford economic assistance to countries struggling for their national independence, and this for the first time in the world's history upon a basis of equality and not of exploitation. And though this is obviously what Ismet Pasha had in mind when he spoke to the All-Union Chamber of Commerce (paragraph 12 of Mr. Strang's despatch under reference), the announcement came as a surprise. The meaning of the arrangement is not, of course, that the Soviet Government will place 8 million dollars at the full disposal of the Turkish Government, because the Soviet Government certainly have not so much foreign exchange to spare. The sum in dollars is merely introduced for purposes of account. The effect of the arrangement will be, I imagine, that the Soviet Union will supply to Turkey, over a fairly short period, machinery, &c., of Soviet manufacture of a value which both sides will agree to be 8 million dollars. In return, Turkey will supply to the Soviet Union, over a longer period, food and raw material, &c., which both sides will also agree to be worth 8 million dollars, possibly with interest. The valuation of a Soviet-produced motor lorry in terms of, say, Turkish tobacco will present a pretty problem.

5. The agreement is, however, a notable one. The Soviet Government appear for the first time in the world market on any considerable scale as a supplier of machinery, which may even conceivably include aircraft and arms. The Turks, who cannot find foreign exchange to meet their existing commitments to foreign contractors, will be able to buy further equipment in return for, say, wool or tobacco or fruit, of which they have presumably no lack. And the Soviet Union being one big firm, the arrival of the Turkish merchandise will disturb no internal market and damage no local private interest, and will be of direct benefit to the community.

6. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora, and to the Department of Overseas Trade.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
WILLIAM STRANG.

Enclosure 1 in No. 43.

Memorandum by Mr. Bullard.

ON the 5th May the local authorities in Leningrad gave a dinner in honour of the Turkish delegation, to which the heads of the foreign consular posts were invited. The President of the Leningrad Soviet, M. Kadatski, made a warm but conventional speech, and Ismet Pasha replied in a speech which, with the halting translation made by a Russian Tatar, sentence by sentence, took over three-quarters of an hour to deliver. No report of the speech was published in Leningrad during the following few days, and it is only to-day (the 10th May) that I find a report in the Moscow "Izvestiya." The report follows the speech closely, except that a passage about the Red army is omitted. The Soviet audience applauded many points in the speech very warmly, but the references to Belov, the officer commanding the Leningrad troops, and to the Red army, its past successes and its expected glorious future, called forth the greatest enthusiasm. It is unusual for Red army officers to be present at functions in Leningrad to which the consular corps are invited. Possibly Belov and some of his staff may have been invited on this occasion because Ismet Pasha is a soldier, and like the Red army had to fight "interventionists." Similarly, Ismet Pasha's feelings as a soldier for other soldiers may have moved him to make warmer statements than the parties afterwards thought it wise to set down in print. The impression I got was that the Soviet audience was taken by surprise

by the warmth of Ismet Pasha's speech. In their enthusiasm at his compliments —in particular, his compliments to Leningrad, which aroused local patriotism— they appeared to pay no attention to a phrase which my Turkish neighbour at dinner pointed out to me as the essential part of the speech. This phrase reads in the published report: "We wish each other well. Each of us finds that what is done in the neighbouring friendly country is good." What Ismet Pasha said was rather stronger: "In view of the friendly relations existing between Soviet Russia and Nationalist Turkey, each must necessarily approve what the other does in its own territory." According to my neighbour (I omitted to find out his name; he is one of the members of Parliament for Istanbul and Minister of Agricultural Co-operation), the Turks have been troubled by Communist propaganda and agitation, and they wished to make it clear that this sort of thing must cease. If this was the intention, the proportion of jam to powder was too large for the dose to be fully effective, even though Ismet Pasha emphasised the point by referring repeatedly to *Nationalist* Turkey in contra-distinction to the *Soviet* Union.

Ismet Pasha laid great stress on his responsible position, and said that he spoke with the knowledge that what he was saying would soon be known to the whole world.

R. W. BULLARD.

Enclosure 2 in No. 43.

Summary of a Report published in the "Isvestiya" of May 10, 1932, of a Speech made by Ismet Pasha at a Dinner given in Leningrad in Honour of the Visit of the Turkish Delegation.

ISMET PASHA said he was glad to speak among responsible representatives of Soviet society. Such a task could only be accomplished if perfect sincerity were employed. He might be inadequate to the task, but he begged his audience to believe in his sincerity.

He and his colleagues had noticed with great pleasure the cordial and sincerely friendly feelings shown towards them in Soviet Russia. On the occasion of official visits the parties usually consider it sufficient if the protocol is carried out, but on this occasion he could not fail to notice something more than that: proofs of mutual confidence.

In Leningrad they had been able to realise the great significance attached to science and art by the U.S.S.R. The beneficent influence of Soviet science was not confined to the Soviet Union, but spread over the whole of humanity. In Leningrad people were happy because they were accomplishing the tasks which had been set them. Let them not envy other towns, or departments in other places. It seemed to him that Leningrad was in the forefront of Soviet science, just as it had been in the forefront at the time of the revolutionary struggle. He noticed that his words gave his hearers pleasure. He wished not only to say how Leningrad had won his heart, but also to express, with a due sense of responsibility, the hope that through his hearers the great friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Nationalist Turkey might be widened and strengthened. He wanted the whole world to hear the secret of that friendship. The secret was simple: the friendship was founded, now as twelve years ago, on mutual confidence.

Ismet Pasha then said: "We wish each other well. Each of us finds that what is done in the neighbouring friendly country is good." Whatever the difference in their institutions and in the means they used to solve their problems, psychological factors played a great part, with other factors, in international relations as in relations between individuals.

If Soviet Russia and Turkey wished to establish their friendship it would be artificial if they proceeded from outer forms alone. It must rest in real interests, in mutual confidence.

If after his return home a foreigner asked him, a Nationalist, what he thought about the Soviet Union, he would reply: "The Soviet system is not ours, but that does not prevent its being the most suitable for the Soviet Union."

What he was saying there he was prepared to repeat in any other place whatsoever. Nothing seemed to him simpler and more natural than this declaration. In international affairs friendships were strong when they corresponded to geographical conditions, common interests and other factors. The

friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Turkey owed its solidity to the fact that it rested on these conditions. The Turks were convinced that in all circumstances the U.S.S.R. would be guided by the friendship which bound them together. Similarly, Turkey would in all circumstances remember her friendship with the U.S.S.R.

In conclusion, Ismet Pasha proposed a toast to the local representatives (including Belov, officer commanding the troops), and to Stalin and other leaders.

[E 2448/34/44] No. 44

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May* 20.)

(No. 157.)

Sir, *Angora, May* 8, 1932.

SINCE the dissolution of the Liberal party, reported in my despatch No. 439 of the 19th November, 1930, its leader Fethi Bey and his few followers have been wandering in the wilderness, the followers at least, looking back with longing to the fleshpots of the Popular party from which they went forth at the Gazi's wish.

2. Rumour has lately been busy with the name of Fethi Bey, at one time appointing him to the Embassy in Paris with the object of securing a favourable issue of the debt negotiations, at another—as suggested in Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 108 of the 21st March—choosing him as successor to Ismet Pasha. The Popular party, however, would have none of him. It, no doubt, shares the general opinion that Fethi is too weak to rule the country at this time of world crisis, and that the country's destinies are best entrusted to the tenacity and driving force of Ismet. Fethi Bey, therefore, remains quietly at Constantinople, but still enjoys the favour of the Gazi, who does not hesitate, when occasion offers, to do him public honour.

3. The Gazi's favour has not been withheld from Fethi Bey's followers in their exile—a contrast to the attitude of the Popular party, which has allowed time to elapse before deciding to pardon fully their defection. Apart from Agaoglu Ahmet Bey, who, secure in his professorial chair at Stambul, is no longer concerned with politics, the former Liberal Deputies made early application for readmission to the ranks of the Popular party, but were passed over in the choice of Deputies for the Grand National Assembly in April of last year. Later in the year it was announced that Nuri Bey, ex-Deputy for Kutahya, and secretary of the Liberal party, Mehmet Emin Bey—the poet—ex-Deputy of Sebin Karahisar, Talat Bey, ex-Deputy for Angora and Tahsin Bey, ex-Deputy for Erzerum, had applied to be enrolled as adherents of the Popular party and had been accepted. Early this year Nuri Bey and Mehmet Emin Bey were designated as Popular party candidates for the vacant Deputyships of Gazi Antap and Urfa, and have now been elected and taken their seats.

4. So ends the experiment of an organised and united Opposition. While it lived it gave rise to animated scenes in the country and lively debates in the Assembly, due to a certain personal feeling which the creation and existence of the Liberal party excited in Ismet Pasha. The present group of "Independents," whom the Popular party allowed to become Deputies, at the wish of the Gazi, in order that views other than those held by the Popular party might be aired, has no cohesion, and excites little interest. It already show signs of decay, for it has been recently announced that Enver Bey, elected Independent Deputy for Balikesir in 1931, has been admitted to the Popular party, which evidently thinks that although one-man rule was bad and brought the Ottoman Empire to ruin, one-party government cannot but be beneficial, and will restore Turkey to its former greatness.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2450/449/44] No. 45.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received May 20.)

(No. 164.)

Sir, *Angora, May 13, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 154 of the 28th April last reporting the departure of Ismet Pasha for Russia, I have the honour to report that he and the majority of the Turkish delegates, who accompanied him, returned to Constantinople on the 11th instant on the Soviet steamship "Gruzis." The remainder of the Turkish delegation, which includes representatives of the Ministry of National Economy, are prolonging their stay in Russia in order to have further opportunities of studying and profiting by Russian methods and results in the branches in which they specialise.

2. It is as yet too early to gauge the results of the visit of the President of the Council to Russia. The letters of Yunus Nadi, who accompanied the delegation, reveal an astonishment at and admiration for Russia's immense resources and its military strength, and a sincere pleasure at the existence and durability of Turco-Russian friendship. Yunus Nadi seems to have been greatly touched by the hospitality and marks of friendship lavished on the delegation and surpassing all their expectations. Other Turkish journalists show less enthusiasm than Yunus Nadi. They insist that the Soviet system is not suitable for Turkey, and that friendship with Russia must not preclude friendship with Western Powers. Enthusiasm is entirely absent from an article in the "Milliyet," which on the day of the return of the delegation from Russia, strongly criticised the Soviet Government for creating continual difficulties for Turkish merchants in Russia, and for continuing to carry on Communist propaganda in Turkey.

3. One event which took place during Ismet Pasha's stay in Russia has given rise to much speculation here. This was the conclusion on the 6th May of an agreement, given wide publicity in the Turkish press, in virtue of which the Soviet Government will open for Turkey a credit of 8 million dollars for textile, sugar-refining and other machinery, to be repaid in Turkish goods, without interest, in twenty years. The Soviet Government further makes Turkey a present of a tractor, three large and two small tanks, two motor-lorries and a motor-bus. It is my impression that the suggestion that this credit should be opened came from the Soviet side, possibly as a hint that, although Turkey was pleasantly engaged in flirting with Western Powers and the League, there was still nothing like Moscow for real solid friendship. My impression is encouraged by an observation of Tevfik Rüştü that it was Turkey who fixed the limit of 8 million dollars, for the Russians were prepared to give a much bigger sum.

4. It is certain that the credit will ease the financial situation, now faced with a large gap in the budget, as it will save Turkey paying for material which would otherwise have had to be met out of revenue, and it is possible that both Russia and Turkey hope that it will avert the calamity of Turkey's applying to Paris for a loan. I have even heard it suggested that the desire of Turkey to enter the League of Nations is not unconnected with the hope of obtaining a loan on less irksome conditions than those which France may offer. In this connexion, it is possibly significant that Saracoglu Sukru Bey, who was reported to have been on the point of leaving for Paris, some two or three weeks ago, has, on one pretext or another, put off his journey and, when Ismet Pasha returned from Russia, was still in Turkey, doubtless for the purpose of learning the decisions at which Ismet Pasha had arrived on the conclusion of his Russian tour.

5. The effect of the credit remains to be seen. It is fairly clear that Turkey, which is postponing payment for the war and railway material supplied to it by foreign firms, and which has recently ordered every individual in Turkey to declare the amount of foreign currency in his possession, is acutely feeling the financial pinch, and may have preferred to borrow from its Soviet friend before applying to its French foe. On the other hand, the operation may be but the beginning of series of agreements founded on barter, which Turkey is prepared to conclude with any State that may so desire.

6. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Moscow.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2657/2617/44] No. 46.

Mr. Ramsay to Sir John Simon.—(Received May 31.)

(No. 239.)

Sir, *Athens, May 25, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to inform you that the Italian steamer "Tevere," bearing the Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs on their official visit to Italy, put into the Piræus on the 23rd May for a few hours. Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüştü Bey were met by the President of the Republic and the Minister for Foreign Affairs; the Prime Minister was unable to meet them, as he was laid up with an attack of phlebitis. Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüştü Bey therefore called at his residence, in company with the President of the Republic and M. Michalakopoulos, where a long and friendly conversation took place.

2. In an article on the passage of the Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs through the Piræus, the "Eleftheron Vima" states that, although M. Veniselos was the first to embark on a policy of drawing closer to Turkey and of friendship for that country, this policy has now been unreservedly adopted by all political parties in Greece, and the President of the Republic was able to inform his Turkish visitors accordingly.

3. I have transmitted a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora.

I have, &c.
PATRICK RAMSAY.

[E 2658/2617/44] No. 47.

Sir R. Graham to Sir John Simon.—(Received May 31.)

(No. 409.)

Sir, *Rome, May 28, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the Turkish Prime Minister, Ismet Pasha, with his wife, the Foreign Minister, Tevfik Rüştü Bey, with his wife and daughter, and a large party of Turkish Deputies and journalists, arrived in Rome on the 25th May. They were met at the station by Signor Mussolini, Signor Grandi and a number of high Government officials.

2. On the morning of their arrival the Turkish Ministers laid wreaths on the tombs of the Kings of Italy in the Pantheon, and on the grave of the Unknown Soldier. They then called at the Quirinal to pay their respects to the King and Queen of Italy, and remained to luncheon with their Majesties. At the same time the head of the Prime Minister's Press Department entertained to luncheon a party of Turkish journalists.

3. In the afternoon Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü Bey were received by Signor Mussolini at the Palazzo Venezia. After an hour's interview, at which Signor Grandi was present, a protocol was signed by the four Ministers, prolonging for five years the Italo-Turkish Treaty of Neutrality, Conciliation and Regulation of Judicial Procedure of 1928, with the stipulation that, at its expiry, the treaty might be automatically renewed for a similar period.

4. On the 26th May the Turkish Ministers were entertained to luncheon by Signor Grandi, while, in the evening, Signor Mussolini gave a large dinner-party, at which cordial speeches were exchanged by the two Prime Ministers. The Duce expressed the desire for a further development of the policy of economic and political understanding between Italy and Turkey in the cause of peace and stability, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean, and these sentiments were re-echoed by Ismet Pasha in his reply.

5. Yesterday morning the Turkish Ministers visited the land reclamation works in the Pontine Marshes. In the afternoon they were present at the Italian Air Force display at the Littorio Aerodrome, and in the evening they attended a party at the Turkish Embassy, at which I was present. I took the opportunity of conversing with Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü Bey. The latter told me that,

although they were delighted with the cordiality shown, the visit was purely one of courtesy, and that the only concrete result had been the signature of the protocol referred to above. This was confirmed by Signor Fani, Signor Guariglia and Signor Chigi, of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, who were also present, and with whom I discussed the Turkish visit. I asked Signor Chigi (who is Signor Grandi's "chef de cabinet") whether the Italian Government had not been able to extract any commercial concession from the Turkish Government, and he replied quite frankly that they had endeavoured to do so, but had failed. They had found the Turkish delegation extremely unforthcoming in this respect. Tevfik Rüştü Bey gave me an account of the Turkish economic situation, which bore out that given in Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 127 of the 11th April. He explained that, with the greatest goodwill, Turkey was not in a position to make purchases abroad.

6. The visit comes to an end to-morrow, when the whole party is to return to Turkey.

I have, &c.
R. GRAHAM.

[E 2711/449/44] No. 48.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 3.)

(No. 170.)

Sir, *Angora, May 19, 1932.*

FROM my conversations with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs since their return from Moscow it is clear that they, and the numerous Deputies and journalists who accompanied them, were deeply impressed by what they saw in Russia, but I doubt whether the Soviet Government succeeded, if indeed it hoped or tried to do so, in turning Turkey's eyes from the West or in drawing the political bonds of the two countries any tighter. Nor, save in one possible respect, to which I shall return later, do I detect in the returned travellers any wish or intention to apply to Turkey the methods they seem to have admired so much in Russia.

2. On the other hand the Turks certainly feel, and probably rightly, that the visit has served a very useful purpose. It has enabled the Turkish leaders to clear away all grounds for misunderstanding that might arise from the very different views of government and administration held in the two countries and the Turks consider that the genuine friendship between them and the Russians will now be all the stronger because both sides know and understand the points on which they differ. In nearly every public declaration that he made in Russia Ismet Pasha laid stress on the "Nationalist" character of the Turkish State and pointed out that each country should develop on the lines that best suited its characteristics, but that that was no reason why the two countries should not be sincere and loyal friends. Tevfik Rüştü told me that the two Governments now understood one another so well that when Turkey joined the League of Nations it would be the Soviet Government that would defend her action against any voices of protest that might be raised in Moscow. (The Minister said "when," not "if and when.")

3. There is, however, one outstanding result of the visit which may seem to throw doubt on its platonic character—the credit of 8 million dollars' worth of agricultural and textile machinery, to be paid for in instalments of Turkish produce. From what the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs have said to me I have the strong impression that this was a spontaneous act on the part of the Soviet Government. "C'est un magnifique cadeau qu'on nous a offert," said Tevfik Rüştü and he continued, as I reported in my despatch No. 164 of the 13th May, that it was he who had to restrain Russian generosity. I read this gesture as partly intended to bring home to Turkey the contrast between her financial difficulties with Western States and Western contractors and the real friendship of Russia and partly as a bit of calculated propaganda: "We are not so hard up that we can't afford to help a friend in need, and moreover our industrial programme is leaping ahead so fast that we can easily spare 8 million

dollars' worth of machinery." Of course, by accepting the loan Turkey puts herself under a certain obligation, but while the Turkish Government is grateful for a generous and timely act, it feels no doubt about its capacity to meet the obligation and will not, I am confident, change its policy out of gratitude.

4. I think, too, that there may have been another factor to account for the Turkish readiness to accept the advance. I found both Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü tremendously impressed by the industrial development they witnessed. Probably neither of them had ever seen big industrial works before, while certainly neither of them has any technical capacity wherewith to judge the efficiency of the huge machines and what those machines produce. The sight of the machines, the gigantic cranes, the great shafts of the turbines, the clanging, the bustle, the "model" workmen's dwellings springing up faster than blocks of luxury flats in Pera, all seem to have shed a glamour over the travellers which still holds them in thrall. Add to this that one of Ismet's dearest wishes is the development of industry in this most unadapted country and one can see that the offer of 8 million dollars' worth of machinery would be irresistible.

5. In the first paragraph of this despatch I implied that in one respect the Turkish Government might wish to apply the methods they saw in action in Russia. The tendency in this country, under the pressure of budgetary difficulties, is more and more towards the creation of State monopolies. In Russia, Ismet Pasha saw the doctrine of State monopolies pushed to the *n*th degree, and, in the Russian offer of the 8 million dollars' worth of machinery, had an example of its practical working. I have little doubt but that he felt that a similar system, adapted to the different conditions of Turkey, would enable him to meet his financial difficulties without being obliged, as is the case at present, to restrict the industrial development of the country on which he has set his heart. It seems, therefore, not impossible that we may see the policy of creating State monopolies for all classes of produce in Turkey being actively pushed on.

6. Lastly, I am pretty sure that neither Ismet Pasha nor Tevfik Rüştü, especially the former, was quite blind to the other side of the Russian shield. They fully realise the sacrifices which the Russian people were being called upon to endure and the terrific strain which the Soviet policy imposed on the country, and they felt that not a five-year, nor a ten-year, nor a fifteen-year plan, would achieve the aims of the Soviet Government. But they received a deep impression of the ability of that Government to maintain its hold over the country, of its capacity to adapt itself to changes in circumstances and to follow the line of least resistance, of its skill to gauge the precise moment when to slacken the tension, and, above all, of the genuine idealism which inspires the Communist party and which will enable them to come out successful in the end. They feel that there is no danger of internal revolution, nor of the Soviet régime being upset by attack from outside, for foreign aggression would unite the 160 million Russians as never before in history and must inevitably fail. The one danger they see to this Soviet edifice is if Russia seeks adventure beyond her frontiers. If the Red army met with defeat, the whole structure might collapse and the Soviet Union break up into its component parts. But they are both convinced that the Soviet authorities are fully alive to this and have no aggressive intentions whatever, and they know that in spite of Soviet fears to the contrary the danger of a foreign attack on Russia is negligible. They sympathised with Russian feelings towards foreign nations with their possibilities of intervention or domination, and they were impressed by seeing how Russia is making herself independent of foreign material—especially war material—by creating her own factories and in many cases by seizing factories of foreigners and turning them to national use.

7. Time alone will show if the estimate of Russia, which I have ventured to attribute to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs is just, I think that in many respects, and to a certain degree, it is, but I also think that they over-estimate both the effect and the proportion of industrialisation. Say that the Russian Government have 4½ million people now occupied in industry and that it succeeds in another five or ten years in raising the number to 12 million, which will in itself be a remarkable achievement, that still leaves 148 million peasants, who constitute the real problem. Nor do I think that Ismet or Tevfik Rüştü allow enough for the Russian character. The very characteristics of the Russian people which alone made the Soviet experiment possible are those

which make them, and will keep them, inefficient by comparison with other peoples in the complicated technical and mechanical work which modern civilisation demands.

8. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Moscow.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2714/1153/44] No. 49.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 3.)

(No. 177. Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora, May 21, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the President of the Republic gave me an audience to-day for the purpose of handing to him the specially bound volumes of the official history of the Dardanelles campaign, which had been presented to him by His Majesty's Government.

2. When I originally applied through the Protocol Department for an audience for this purpose, the matter was treated with a good deal of official fussiness, and I was all the more agreeably suprised to find myself received by the Gazi alone, without any paraphernalia of Ministers, "chef de protocole," or official interpreters. On previous occasions when I have had the honour of speaking with the Gazi, he has sometimes grown bored with, or suspicious of, his interpreters and, as he warmed up, carried on the conversation himself in French or even in German, but this is the first time, so far as I know, that he has received a foreign representative alone or held the conversation in French from the beginning of the interview.

3. After explaining to his Excellency that the purpose of the history was to provide the military student and posterity with a clear, true and impartial account of the inception, execution and final failure of the attempt to force the passage of the Dardanelles, I said that my Government hoped that a work of such interest, both from the military point of view and for the witness it bore to the magnificent efforts and the immortal courage of the troops on both sides, would be welcome to his Excellency, whose intervention at the decisive moment had counted for so much in the result of the battle, the issue of the campaign, and the future of his nation, and I asked the President to accept the book as an expression of the sentiments which my Government felt towards one whom they held, in the words with which they conveyed the gift to him, a great general, a noble adversary and a generous friend. The President was manifestly touched by the happy and chivalrous idea of His Majesty's Government, and he replied by asking me to convey his most cordial thanks and appreciation.

4. I then brought in Major O'Leary, my military attaché, and handed the volumes over to the Gazi, who at once pulled up a table, opened out the map of the Anafarta region and described to us his own actions during the critical days of April and August 1915. I enclose a note which Major O'Leary has made of the Gazi's interesting reminiscences of those critical days. His Excellency then went on to talk on general topics, and seemed to be ready to continue for a long time, but after an hour I felt that I could not put any further strain on his Excellency's French and asked leave to withdraw.

5. The Gazi was suffering some pain from his teeth, but otherwise appeared to be in excellent health, and nothing could have been pleasanter or more charming than his attitude throughout the interview. He was obviously touched by the grateful thought of His Majesty's Government, and he showed a simple and genial side of his character, very different from the pose of piercing-eyed utterer of divine truths which he usually adopts before the Turkish people.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 49.

The Gazi's Observations on the Gallipoli Campaign.

I WAS originally commanding all the troops in the Gallipoli Peninsula, but some time before the landing of the British the southern sector was taken over by Colonel Sami Bey, who was senior to me, but who was quite incompetent. I was then commanding the 19th Division, and my headquarters were north of Maidos. The Corps Commander was at Gallipoli.

I kept my division occupied with training parades. One day, when I had a regiment out on a tactical exercise in the direction of Jong Bair (Chunuk Bair), I climbed that hill, alone with one of my staff. Suddenly I saw a line of Turkish soldiers coming towards me from the direction of Ari Burnu (Anzac). "The enemy is approaching," they said. "What enemy?" "The English—they have landed." They added that they were retiring, as they had no more ammunition for their rifles. I ordered them to fix bayonets and to lie down. The leading English troops, not understanding what was happening, did the same. Meanwhile I had called up the regiment, who fortunately had ball ammunition with them. This was the beginning of the struggle for the Jong Bair ridge, which is the key to the whole peninsula.

Before the August landings I persistently pointed out to the Higher Command that the English, being checked on both fronts, would certainly try a flanking movement, and that the only place for such an attack was the Suvla area. They refused to accept this view and the Corps Commander, Feyzi Bey, came himself to my command post, to point out to me on the ground that a landing at Suvla was impossible. Later on they became uneasy, and repeatedly asked me what I thought should be done. "Take the necessary measures," I replied; "give me the command of the whole front." "Surely that would be too much." "No," I said, "it would be too little!" Liman von Sanders was ready to do this, but Enver Pasha would not allow it.

When the attack came they rang me up to know if I had heard of any British troops at Suvla. "How can there be," I answered; "you yourselves said it was impossible."

The situation was critical, as the enemy at Ari Burnu had succeeded in gaining the heights of Jong Bair, and my junior commanders there told me they could not hold out any longer. "You must hold out for one day more," I said, "till I have stopped the enemy in front of Anafarta." I hurried across personally and saw the British troops in columns near Suvla Bay. I had few troops here, and we could not have held if they had attacked, but they waited. I am told that General Hamilton himself came to Suvla to order an attack. Meanwhile I had ordered a counter-attack, and then directed our troops to hold on, while I hastened back to the other front, where we were successful in turning the British off the heights again.

All through the campaign I had two battles to fight—one with the enemy, the other with the Higher Command.

Çankaya, May 21, 1932.

[E 2772/2617/44] No. 50.

Sir R. Graham to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 7.)

(No. 412.)

Sir, *Rome, May 30, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 409 of the 28th instant, I have the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüştü Bey have carried out an exceedingly full programme, in the course of which they visited the air display, military establishments, the International Institute of Agriculture, the Academy of Physical Education, the headquarters of the Fascist party, the Chamber and the Senate. Amongst the many luncheons and dinners which they attended was one given by the Soviet Ambassador, to which only the Turkish Mission, Signor Grandi, Signor Giunta and various Italian officials were invited.

2. On the conclusion of the visit the following communiqué was issued to the press :—

"During the five days of their stay in Rome the Prime Minister of the Turkish Republic, Ismet Pasha, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Tevfik Rüstü Bey, have had on various occasions long and exhaustive conversations with the Head of the Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

"These conversations, which were marked by a spirit of exceptional cordiality, and the object of which was the examination of the various international questions of the day, both economic and political, as well as those which concern more directly Italy and Turkey, have confirmed the identity of the views of the Italian and Turkish Governments in these important matters.

"The representatives of the two countries have observed with satisfaction that the policy of Turkey and Italy, based on the reciprocal friendship and understanding between the two countries, has enabled them to secure collaboration which is very useful to the general work of reconstruction and to the pacific stabilisation of the Eastern Mediterranean.

"They have, therefore, jointly agreed to continue in the same line of policy and to increase the friendly contacts between the two Governments with a view to safeguarding and developing their common interests especially in the Near East.

"The representatives of the two Governments have therefore, in particular, examined the means most suitable to stimulating as much as possible Italo-Turkish commercial relations and to establishing even closer economic and financial collaboration.

"A mixed Italo-Turkish commission will be nominated as soon as possible to give in detail practical and rapid effect to this programme."

3. It seems clear from the last paragraphs of the communiqué that a serious effort will be made to reach an Italo-Turkish economic agreement and we ought not to accept at its face value the statement of Tevfik Rüstü Bey and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs that the visit was purely one of courtesy. The press has commented with marked restraint on the communiqué, the reason probably being that the Ministry for Foreign Affairs have been kept very much in the dark and are unable to give them a lead.

I have, &c.
R. GRAHAM.

[C 4801/4801/19] No. 51.

Mr. Ramsay to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 13.)

(No. 262.)

Sir, *Athens, June 2, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No 239 of the 25th May regarding the passage through the Piræus of the Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs on their official visit to Rome, I have the honour to inform you that Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüstü Bey arrived in the Piræus at 10 A.M. on the 1st June on their return journey to Constantinople. They were met by the Prime Minister, the Minister for Agriculture and the Turkish Minister here. Half an hour later they were joined by M. Veniselos, who was present at the conversation which ensued between M. Papanastassiou and the Turkish Minister.

2. According to the semi-official "Messager d'Athènes," M. Papanastassiou assured the Turkish Ministers that the foreign policy of the present Greek Government would be similar to that of its predecessor, but more accentuated as regards friendship between Greece and Turkey, which remains the basis of Greek policy, and that Turkish citizens arriving in Greece could regard it as their own country in the same manner as the Greeks who have recently visited Constantinople and Angora were made to feel at home.

3. The "Messager d'Athènes" states that the Greek and Turkish Ministers agreed to bring into force at once the postal union recommended by the unofficial Balkan Conference. They agreed that other recommendations of the Balkan Conference could also be brought into effect, and decided that a mixed commission

should be formed to examine the question of an exchange of goods between Greece and Turkey. In reply to an enquiry by M. Papanastassiou, the Turkish Ministers said that they would be delighted to welcome the Greek naval school ship at Constantinople. Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüstü Bey reiterated their desire to see a settlement of the differences between Bulgaria and Greece as soon as possible, to which M. Papanastassiou replied that his Government were ready to help in securing this settlement and would make no difficulties.

4. After an official luncheon given by the Greek Government the Turkish Ministers continued their journey to Constantinople.

5. The Athens press reproduces this morning a telegram from Yunus Nadi Bey to his newspaper the "Jumhuriet" in Constantinople, stating that M. Veniselos has accepted the invitation of Ismet Pasha to stay as his guest for a week at Yalova in August.

6. I have transmitted a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora, and to His Majesty's representatives at Sofia, Belgrade, Bucharest and Durazzo.

I have, &c.
PATRICK RAMSAY.

[E 2974/1153/44] No. 52.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 16.)

(No. 184.)

Sir, *Angora, May 31, 1932.*

THANKS to the article in the "Temps," reported in my despatch No. 183 of the 28th instant, the courteous and friendly action of His Majesty's Government in sending the Gazi a copy of the official history of the Dardanelles Campaign has become the occasion for an almost embarrassing display of appreciation on the part of the Turkish Government and press.

2. I have the honour to enclose a copy of a letter which has been addressed to me by the acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, which is not only remarkable for the warmth of the expressions therein employed, but because the Gazi and the Turkish Government evidently wished that the sentiments contained therein should be made known to the Turkish people. The text of the letter has been published *in extenso* in the semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" of the 31st May, together with a photograph of the words of dedication, and the "Temps" article has been made the theme of a leader in the same number by Falih Rifki, of which a translation is also enclosed herein.(1)

3. I have written a suitable interim reply to Sükrü Kaya Bey, but I have no doubt that much gratification would be caused if I might receive your instructions to convey to the Turkish Government the pleasure felt by His Majesty's Government at the great appreciation of their action which has been shown in Turkey. You will also observe that the Gazi asks that his thanks may be conveyed to His Majesty the King, and I should be grateful if this fact might be submitted to the attention of His Majesty.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 52.

Turkish Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs to Sir G. Clerk.

M. l'Ambassadeur, *Ankara, le 28 mai 1932.*

APRÈS vous avoir reçu la semaine dernière, M. le Président de la République a lu attentivement la dédicace inscrite par le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique sur le livre dont vous aviez bien voulu vous charger de lui faire présent au nom de votre Gouvernement.

L'hommage rendu à un grand commandant, un noble adversaire et un ami généreux par les dirigeants d'un peuple de *gentlemen* est non seulement un acte

(1) Not printed.

de courtoisie de la plus noble inspiration, mais aussi et surtout une preuve de loyauté et d'amitié à laquelle autant le Gazi que le Gouvernement de la République ont été extrêmement sensibles.

Reconnaître justement et loyalement les qualités déployées par un adversaire dans les moments de lutte, c'est effacer les amertumes de celle-ci pour ne laisser persister que la belle leçon qui s'en dégage quant aux qualités respectives des deux nations qui ont été aux prises et qui sont décidées sur la base même de cette reconnaissance mutuelle puisée à la meilleure source.

M. le Président de la République pense que les peuples qui savent échafauder sur la compréhension et l'estime réciproques la structure de leur amitié peuvent vraiment réussir à la rendre solide, sincère et effective.

Notre grand chef me charge spécialement de prier votre Excellence de bien vouloir transmettre à Sa Majesté le Roi ses plus vifs remerciements pour la belle et délicate attention montrée par le Gouvernement royal à l'égard de sa personne et à celui du peuple turc.

En m'acquittant de cette agréable mission, je vous prie, M. l'Ambassadeur, de faire part au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté que le Gouvernement de la République voit dans son geste une nouvelle preuve de l'amitié si heureusement établie entre les deux pays.

Veuillez, &c.
S. KAYA.

[E 2977/1541/44] No. 53.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received June* 16.)

(No. 193.)
Sir, *Angora, June* 3, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the occasion of the birthday of His Majesty the King, I held the customary reception at this Embassy.

2. The Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs had not yet returned to Angora from their official visit to Italy, with the result that a number of the leading Turkish personalities who formed part of the delegation were unavoidably prevented from being present, but the reception was attended by the President of the Grand National Assembly, the Acting Prime Minister, the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, and most of the other Ministers, together with a large number of Turkish officials, Deputies and notables, the Diplomatic Corps and members of the British and foreign colonies. The Director of the Protocol paid a separate call to convey the congratulations of the Turkish Government, and those of the President of the Republic were sent through his secretary-general and aide-de-camp.

3. There was abundant evidence of the friendly relations now prevailing between Great Britain and Turkey, and more than one reference testified to the good impression which has been made on Turks generally by the recent presentation to Gazi Mustafa Kemal on behalf of His Majesty's Government of the "Official History of the Dardanelles Campaign."

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2980/2617/44] No. 54.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received June* 16.)

(No. 196.)
Sir, *Angora, June* 5, 1932.

THE Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs returned to Angora from Rome yesterday morning, and Tevfik Rüştü Bey was good enough to see me in the afternoon in order to give me his impressions of the visit.

2. His Excellency was as expansive and open as usual, but it seemed to me that his tone was decidedly less enthusiastic than after his return from Moscow, though that may be temperamental, for Tevfik Rüştü is spiritually far more akin to the Bolshevists than to the Fascists. Tevfik Rüştü said that Ismet Pasha and

he had not gone to Italy for any other purpose than to pay a visit of courtesy which had been long promised, and to reaffirm the friendship between the two countries. The visit had no hidden aim and no specific political purpose. Indeed, the extension of the Turco-Italian Treaty of Neutrality, Conciliation and Judicial Regulation of 1928, which was the one definite political result of the visit, was more of a gesture than anything else, since that agreement has still two years to run before any question of renewal arises. His Excellency summed up by saying that Turkey had got neither more nor less than, but just as much as, she had expected, and that seemed to him an eminently satisfactory result.

3. I reminded his Excellency that Ismet Pasha had none the less come home with 300 million Italian lire, which I had the impression had not been in the original programme. Tevfik Rüştü replied that it was true that the Turkish delegation had not gone to Rome seeking a loan, but naturally the economic position had been discussed, and this advance was not a loan so much as a friendly adjustment of Turco-Italian financial relations, which the Italians had offered as an earnest of their good feelings towards Turkey. As I reported in my telegram No. 13 of the 5th instant, one-third of the money goes to pay Turkey's outstanding creditors in Italy, one-third is a credit for any subsequent purchases of Italian goods, and one-third is at the disposal of the Turkish Government to be used as it thinks fit. I gathered that such details as the rate of interest and the term for which the advance is to run have still to be settled.

4. The Prime Minister received me this afternoon and spoke in the same sense as the Minister for Foreign Affairs did yesterday, but insisted even more than Tevfik Rüştü had done upon the fact that the visit was not aimed against any other Power or group of Powers, and did not connote or foreshadow the adhesion of Turkey to any political grouping. He had been a little disturbed by the tone of the French, and especially of the Yugoslav press, for he had hoped that his perfectly sincere and open declarations would have dissipated all possibility of misunderstanding the motives of Turkey. In any case he assured me that there was nothing whatever behind the visit beyond what he and the Minister for Foreign Affairs had openly declared.

5. I see no reason to doubt the assertions of the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs. To conclude that Turkish policy is in any way directed against France or her allies, or to suspect that Italy, or even Russia, have succeeded in including Turkey in an association directed against any other group of European Powers, would be in contradiction to the whole foreign policy of Turkey during the last six years. Moreover, from what Tevfik Rüştü said to me I have the impression that the Turks have come back from Rome with the feeling that, while all is well with Italy so long as Signor Mussolini lasts, they do not know what may happen should he fall a victim to the ever-present assassin.

6. As for the loan, everything points to this having been an unexpectedly friendly gesture of the Italian Government, or possibly, as suggested in Sir R. Graham's telegram, No. 74, of the 4th June, of Signor Mussolini himself. No doubt Ismet Pasha and his advisers hoped during the visit to come to some more or less satisfactory arrangement about Turkey's financial commitments in Italy, and were prepared, in return for facilities for settling the demands of their immediate creditors, to undertake to make further purchases in Italy. But I should doubt whether the 300 million lire was in their programme. I am confirmed in this by the attitude of the Turkish Minister of Finance, who, when he heard of the Italian advance, said that it was not a loan, because Turkey could not and would not contract foreign loans at present, and that the 100 million lire would not be inscribed in the books of the Ministry of Finance. The Prime Minister would make such use of it for the development of the country as seemed good to him, but he, the Minister of Finance, would not take it into account when estimating the financial resources at his disposal.

7. I have sent a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2983/811/44] No. 55.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received June* 16.)

(No. 199.)

Sir, *Angora, June* 10, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report, with reference to my despatch No. 99 of the 17th March last, that the Grand National Assembly passed, with some modifications, on the 4th June, the Bill for the reservation of certain professions to Turkish nationals. The following is a translation of the text of the Bill, the text of the law being not yet available :—

Article 1. Within the Republic of Turkey the professions and occupations mentioned below are reserved exclusively to Turkish nationals. The exercise of such professions and occupations is forbidden to those who are not of Turkish nationality :—

Pedlar, musician, photographer, compositor, broker, clothier, hatmaker, shoemaker, stockbroker, vendor of State monopoly products, tourist guide and interpreter, labourer in the building, iron and timber trades, permanent or temporary employee in general transport, water, heating, lighting and communication concerns, porter employed in loading or unloading on land, chauffeur and chauffeur's assistant, general labourer, watchman, doorkeeper and caretaker in flats, hotels and commercial premises, male and female servants in hotels, hans, public baths, cafés, casinos, dance-halls and bars, dancer and singer in bars, veterinary surgeon, and chemist.

Art. 2. The undermentioned professions may not be exercised without a special permit issued on the authority of the Executive Council of Ministers :—

(*a*) Aeroplane mechanic and pilot.
(*b*) Employee in enterprises connected with the State or vilayets or connected jointly with these and municipalities.

Art. 3. The exercise by foreigners of professions and occupations not reserved to Turkish nationals by this law may, in case of need, be prohibited by decision of the Executive Council of Ministers.

Art. 4. Foreigners employed in the following avocations are exempt from the provisions of this law :—

Doorkeepers of the Embassies and consulates of any foreign State and drivers of vehicles employed by it, whether they are of the nationality of that State or of other foreign nationality.

Art. 5. Foreigners exercising professions and occupations reserved to Turkish nationals on the date of the promulgation of this law are required to abandon such avocations within six months of the date of the promulgation of the law.

Art. 6. Foreigners exercising professions and occupations reserved to Turkish nationals after the expiration of the period specified in article 5 will, by order of the highest local civil official, be effectively restrained from pursuing such avocations, and, in addition, will be handed over to the court of justice with a report which will be drawn up, and will be required to pay a fine of from 10 to 500 liras.

Art. 7. The nationals of foreign States which make administrative and legal reservations in the case of Turkish nationals may be prevented by the decision of the Executive Council of Ministers from the exercise of professions and occupations which they might otherwise exercise.

Art. 8. The opening of shops by foreigners in places which are not centres of either a vilayet or a kaza is prohibited.

This law comes into force as from the date of its publication.

2. It will be seen that there is no specific provision in the law for the recognition of acquired rights of foreigners, and I propose, as soon as I am in possession of the definitive text of the law, to make enquiry at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs on this point. Liberal professions seem to be excluded from the scope of the law by the terms of article 1, but those of article 5 seem to make it

possible to claim that foreigners exercising the profession of doctor and lawyer—callings already reserved by previous legislation to Turkish nationals—must cease to exercise their profession in Turkey within a fixed period.

3. The terms of article 3 make the law all-embracing, but I consider it unlikely, in view of the efforts which were made by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs during the committee stages of the Bill to restrain the nationalistic ardour of Deputies, and to keep out of the Bill material which at one time threatened to make it top-heavy and all-exclusive, that the Council of Ministers will show any inclination to abuse the powers vested in it by the terms of that article.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 2984/2984/44] No. 56.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received June* 16.)

(No. 200.)

Sir, *Constantinople, June* 9, 1932.

IN my despatch No. 183 of the 28th May last I had the honour to report on the bad impression made on the Turkish Government, the press and public opinion by the article in the "Temps" criticising the action of His Majesty's Government in presenting a copy of the history of the Dardanelles campaign to the Gazi.

2. The "Temps," in its issue of the 4th June, has now published a further article, suggesting that Italy should seek in Asia Minor the place in the sun for which she clamours, and implying that she could count on the benevolent moral support of France. This fresh article has aroused an indignation in Angora which finds its freest expression in a leading article of to-day's "République" by Yunus Nadi, proprietor and editor-in-chief of that journal. I enclose a copy of this article.(1) The semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" writes in a more sober strain. It pretends to believe that the opinions of the "Temps" are not those of the French nation, and argues that the suggestion that Italy should seek expansion in Southern Anatolia is obviously intended to sow distrust between Italy and Turkey and springs from resentment at Italo-Turkish friendship, which, however, has no secret aims. The newspaper invites France to realise that both Italy and Turkey hold strongly that all Near Eastern nations should be completely independent. The friendship now existing between Great Britain and Turkey originates in the Mosul Treaty, but may be said to have its rise in England's recognition of Iraq's independence, which is the basis of the treaty. Is it wrong to hope that Syria, too, may one day be independent? Let France ask herself why she is now suspected by the whole world when, up to the outbreak of the Great War, everyone loved her, and why her own newspapers attack those sincere French patriots who are striving to bring France and Turkey together. She will find that it is because her newspapers are in the pay of munition-makers whose only aim is to set nation against nation.

3. My French colleague is in Angora at the moment of writing, and I am therefore unable to say what action he proposes to take to meet the situation. But I have no doubt that he will be able to convince the Turkish Government that such articles in the "Temps" in no way reflect the real opinion of the French Government or of serious opinion in France. None the less, it is unfortunate that ill-feeling should be unnecessarily stirred up in this way, for there are numerous outstanding questions which Comte de Chambrun still has to settle with the Turks, and his task will not be rendered any lighter by these effusions. Incidentally, harm may be caused to British interests in such Franco-British questions as the Ottoman Debt and the Constantinople Quays Company, which are among the difficult questions which France is pressing Turkey to settle.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

(1) Not printed.

[E 3143/3143/44] No. 57.

Sir H. Rumbold to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 24.)

(No. 455.)

Sir, *Berlin, June 20, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to state that, according to the press, a company entitled "Vereinigung zur Förderung des deutsch-türkischen Wirtschaftsverkehrs G.m.b.H." was formed in Berlin on the 15th June, 1932, for the purpose of promoting commerce between Germany and Turkey, particularly with a view to the exchange of goods.

2. The following firms participated in the formation of the new company: Friedrich Krupp, Vereinigte Stahlwerke, Gütehoffnungschütte, Otto Wolff, Orenstein und Koppel, A.E.G., Siemens, Julius Berger, Homère O. Fisani, of Hamburg, and Gebr. Brady, of Hamburg. The chairman of the firm is Otto Wolff.

3. It is believed that the new company will undertake the financing of industrial deliveries to Turkey by the issue of credit notes, which will be used for payments to Turkey in respect of tobacco supplied to the German firm Reemstma A.G. The difficulties arising from the direct exchange of goods will in this way be largely eliminated.

4. A copy of this despatch has been sent to the Department of Overseas Trade.

I have,&c.
HORACE RUMBOLD.

[E 3179/449/44] No. 58.

Sir E. Ovey to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 27.)

(No. 314. Confidential.)

Sir, *Moscow, June 20, 1932.*

WITH reference to Mr. Strang's despatch No. 231 of the 3rd May last regarding the visit of Ismet Pasha to Moscow and Leningrad, I have the honour to report that, according to information emanating from Mr. Berson, the representative of the Polish Telegraph Agency at Moscow, it has been learnt on the authority of the Turkish Embassy that, during the above-mentioned visit, Ismet Pasha initiated negotiations with the Soviet Government regarding the question of the Dardanelles. These negotiations are now understood to be continuing through the normal diplomatic channels.

2. Mr. Berson understood that the Soviet Government would raise no objection to Turkey joining the League of Nations so long as she—*i.e.*, Turkey—agrees to raise the question of the abolition of the international control of the Straits as soon as possible after becoming a member.

3. I report the above information for what it is worth, though confirmation is at present lacking. There would, however, appear to be nothing inherently impossible in the report, as the Soviet Government must, in the nature of things, always be to some extent preoccupied as to the safety of so important a line of communication as that passing through the Dardanelles. Moreover, it would appear that in October of last year, when M. Litvinov visited Angora, he discussed the question of the Dardanelles with the Turkish Government without, however, receiving a satisfactory reply to his request for an assurance that the latter should close the Dardanelles if Russia were at war (Angora despatch No. 361 of the 1st November, 1931). In these circumstances it would appear only natural that the Soviet Government should continue to be preoccupied with the question.

I have, &c.
ESMOND OVEY.

---

o